National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Creative Pedagogies: Troubling the Troubled Waters of Education

BY

Gloria Elizabeth Alice Filax ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Education

IN

Sociology of Education

Department of Educational Foundations

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring, 1995

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-01539-4

Canadä

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Gloria Elizabeth Alice Filax

TITLE OF THESIS: Creative Pedagogy: Troubling the Troubled Waters of Education

DEGREE: Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1995

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of the thesis and to lend or sell copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Gloria Filax

10563 76 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6E 1L4

Date: Jan 4/95

Of writing many books there is no end;
And I who have written much in prose and verse
For others' uses, will write now for mine,–
Will write my story for my better self...
Elizabeth Barrett Browning

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Creative Pedagogies: Troubling the Troubled Waters of Education* submitted by Gloria Elizabeth Alice Filax in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Masters of Education in Sociology of Education.

Dr. M. Assheton-Smith
Supervisor

Dr. Jan Jagodzinski

Dr. Beth Young

December 20, 1994

Dedication

In the event that I never write another major work again, I would like to dedicate this thesis to a number of people.

I dedicate this work to the memory of Alice Elda Ludlam, my grandmother, who felt that women should be educated.

I dedicate this work to the memory of Elizabeth MacIntyre, my grandmother, who loved reading books.

I dedicate this work to Ryan Lindsay Morgan Filax-Wylie, precious child of my borderlands, who provides ongoing love and inspiration for me.

I dedicate this work to my beloved friend and sister Elaine Jean Filax, who loves education, books, and me. Elaine is a constant and dear companion, without whom I would never have survived this far.

I dedicate this work to my life companion, the woman who inspires and nurtures me, provides ongoing love, editing, dialogue, food, in short the essentials of my life: Debra Ann Shogan.

ABSTRACT

While creative pedagogies often question notions of fixed subjectivities, an unproblematized teacher-student binary precludes a wider exploration of implications of subjectivity formation to classroom practice, including expectations that experiences of subjectivity can and should be voiced into classrooms as well as notions of what counts as resistance. A deconstruction of 'voice' opens an understanding that teachers and students come to classrooms embodied and yet only some embodiment "comes to matter" (Butler 1993). An unproblematized invitation to students or teachers to voice their experiences of subjectivity formation into a classroom assumes a sameness in implications of telling, thus not only levelling the categories 'student' and 'teacher', but perpetuating the notion that experiences of those in nondominant groups, whether students or teachers, can be absorbed in their entirety through their telling. I argue that, when 'voice', 'subjectivity' and 'resistance' are recognized to be embodied or "materialized" (Butler 1993), it is possible to begin to reconceptualize the student-teacher dyad and resist the notion that *resistance* is possible only by students to teachers in classrooms and unproblematized by race, gender, class, or sexuality politics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the debt I owe to all of the creative pedagogues whose work I have taken up in my thesis. Without the rich legacy of ideas and theories each of these writers and thinkers have made available, my thesis would not have been possible. I hope that I have honored and taken up their words in a respectful and fluid way. This was my intention.

Many friends and colleagues have been influential in their day to day performances of resistance. I grate-greatfully acknowledge each: Brenda Brown, Melody Burton, Judy Davidson, Sheila Dunphy, Elaine Filax, Ryan Filax-Wylie, Maureen Ford, Monica Kreiner, Kathleen Martindale, Sheryl McInnes,Yvonne Mireau, Jean Noble, Nasrin Rahimieh, Daphne Read, Debra Shogan, Malinda Smith, Randi Warne and Lynne Wiltse.

I have had the good fortune to work in seminar and classroom settings with creative pedagogues and I would like to thank and acknowledge these people: Marilyn Assheton-Smith, Virginia Floresca-Cawagas, Jan Jagodzinski, Debra Shogan, and Toh Swee-Hin. Vive la resistance!

Thank you to my birth family for love and care over the course of my life: my mother Muriel, my father Arthur, and my sisters Muriel June, Elaine Jean and Vivien Heather.

Finally, I would like to thank my supervisor and thesis committee for assisting me in the creation of my own troubled waters--my thesis: Dr. M. Assheton-Smith, Dr. J. Jagodzinski, and Dr. B. Young.

Table of Contents

Foreword--Locating Myself 1

Chapter One--Interrogating Creative Pedagogies 6
    Creative Pedagogues 9
        Paulo Freire 9
            Freire and the Subject 12
            Freire and Dialoguing Voices 16
            Freire and Resistance to Structure 19
        Henry Giroux--Border Crossings Between Theories 20
            Giroux and Wandering Selves, Situated Others 22
            Giroux and Voicing Experiences of Subjectivity 25
            Giroux and Resistance 28
        Situated Others 32
        Feminist Pedagogies 33
            The Situated Subjectivity of Feminist Pedagogy 34
            Voicing Genderized Experience 37
        Queer Pedagogies 40
            Queering Subjectivity 40
            Queering Voice 42
        Race-ing Pedagogies 43
            Race-ing Subjectivity 44
            Race-ing Voice 46
        Situated Resistances 48
    Summary 50

Chapter Two--Embodied Voices 52
    Noninnocent Knowledge 53
        Noninnocence of Formal Education 55
    A Deconstructive Reading of 'Voice' 58
        Voice Implies Speaking 60
        Voice Implies Its Opposite 61
        Voice Implies Listening-Hearing 62
        Voice Implies an Understanding Listener 63
        "Coming to Voice" Implies Hierarchy 64
        Implications of a Deconstruction of 'Voice' 67
    Summary 70

Chapter Three--Voicing Experiences of Subjectivity 72
    Experiences of Subjectivity 73
    'Voicing' Experiences of Subjectivity 79

Problematizing 'Voicing' Experience 81
Problematizing the Problematizing of Experience 86
'Voicing' Experience--Revisited 91

Chapter Four--Resistance 94
Repetitive Tales of Performative Resistances 97
Sexual Harassment--The Unchanging Climate 97
The Una(bash)ed Reality of Lesbian and Gay Lives 100
Re-Colonization of the Post-Colonial or New-Age Racism 103
New Age Class(sic) Education 107
Contextualizing Resistance 108
Performativity of Resistance 109
Border Crossings--Conscious and Unconscious 110
Performance of Resistance 112
Summary 116

Afterword 117

References 119

Foreword

LOCATING MYSELF

In this foreword to the chapters which follow, I wish to emphasize how my own political location impacts what I think it is important to explore. My own situatedness is central to the questions which interest me as well as ways in which I take them up. A self-conscious admission that this work emanates from a politics and that this work has political intentions will seem *forward* to those who wish to hang onto the notion that it is necessary to maintain a distance from one's scholarly work and that politics have no place in scholarly concerns. Much of what I write in the text which follows is an attempt to expose ways in which this myth perpetuates a status quo in which only some bodies "come to matter" (Butler 1993) in educational contexts. I am happy to seem forward to those who wish to hang onto a notion of education-as-usual because this may be an indication that I have troubled those expectations for an education which, all too often, is a process which differentiates some as outside the scope of educational concerns.

Feminism and postmodernism are two approaches I take to my work. I cross-pollinate education with seeds/pollen from feminism and postmodernism, hoping for a plant of a very different nature--a hybrid: in this case, a hybrid education. I see cross-pollination as a politics: not an endpoint, but a beginning. There is neither a fixed nor a knowable end. This allows for a politics of possibility.

Postmodernist thinkers are often charged with abandoning intellectual thinking to a nihilistic morass or a relativistic wasteland. Central to this pejorative is a concern that if something cannot be known with certainty as universal Truth, then nothing can be known. Postmodernism does not rule out knowing; postmodernism calls for qualified, situated or located knowing. Postmodernism is also charged with being apolitical. Yet, postmodern thinkers remind us not to generalize from the local to the global and encourage proliferation of localized differences to destablilize imperialist notions of unity and universality, with a possible effect that hitherto "subjugated" voices might be spoken.

Feminism, which some argue is a type of postmodernism because it calls into question at least some universalizing tendencies, specifically those which take 'man' as the norm (cf. de Lauretis 1987; Hutcheon 1989; Fraser and Nicholson 1990), is nevertheless unresolved about the subject or identity of feminism. As Teresa de Lauretis indicates, 'woman' as the "subject of feminism....is at the same time inside *and* outside the ideology of gender, and conscious of being so, conscious of that twofold pull, of that division, that doubled vision" (de Lauretis 1987, 10). This "complicitous critique" (Hutcheon 1989) places feminism in the somewhat awkward position of calling into question a category while simultaneously taking it up. I see no way around this in my own work. Of necessity, categories that locate us must be taken up in order to deconstruct them. But we must also be clear that problematizing our locations and revealing limits placed on our/selves through categories do not by themselves make these categories go away.

How, then, is it possible to 'locate' myself in this work in such a way that I acknowledge, in Judith Butler's words what is "always already" there (Butler 1990) yet not use this acknowledgment as some sort of perfunctory disclaimer which then clears the way for not having to notice how these categories may impact the work I propose to do?

Who is the me, the self that is inflected in the pages that follow? How do I locate my/selves? I struggle against my white racialization, my female genderization, my middle class-ification; I revel and rebel in my deviation within a heteronormative world. Like a snake, I have shed several of my skins and yet these still inform my/selves in ways that I am of yet only partially aware--christianized within a eurocentric and protestant tradition, class-ified in my growing up years as working class, normalized within a Canadian heterosexual, nuclear family. I am aware that even as I 'out' myself in these ways, I am "always already" in 'closets of meaning' contained by my readers' understanding of these categories and processes.

My interests and concerns are located in this work--they reflect what I believe (from my location) to be important for a reflexive creative pedagogy. In working through these concerns, it has been possible for me to locate myself in another sense of 'locating': not only do the particular questions I address locate my interests and concerns, in identifying these questions I have located or found some parts of myself through a partial genealogical tracing and deconstruction, hitherto not spelled out to myself. This 'locating' is ongoing and often very difficult work because, to the extent to which I am privileged in this culture by processes which have marked me as 'white', 'able', and 'middle-class', uncovering ways in which my location has been dependent on displacing others is troublesome.

In the pages which follow, I return to these locations as I attempt to *interrogate* creative pedagogies--those approaches to teaching and learning which explicitly attempt to disrupt the status quo. By 'interrogation' I include a range of activities which call into question and open up terms and assumptions to "a reusage or redeployment that previously has not been authorized" (Butler 1992, 15). As will become apparent in the chapters which follow, these interrogations include deconstruction, genealogical tracing, confessional telling, counter discourse, and performance. It is up to my readers to take up what I present here, bring your own understanding as to what my locations mean, how each inflects my work, and read for what is missing as well as what is here.

In the first chapter, I engage texts of selected authors of creative pedagogy to explore and critique what each has to say about embodied voices in classrooms, voicing experiences of subjectivity into classrooms, and resistance in classrooms. In my exploration of these texts, I argue that, while creative pedagogues are, for the most part, concerned about subjectivity formation, an unproblematized teacher-student binary precludes a wider exploration of subjectivity formation, particularly as these are effects of classroom practice, including expectations that experiences can and should be voiced into classrooms. Moreover, this binary undermines a more thorough exploration of resistance as an agentic classroom strategy.

In Chapter Two, I turn to a deconstruction of 'voice' in order to open an understanding that teachers and students come to classrooms embodied and yet only some embodiment "comes to matter" (Butler 1993). This is important for making sense of voice as a metaphor for empowerment in creative pedgogies, voicing experiences of subjectivity, as well as resistance in classrooms. I suggest that an unproblematized invitation to students or teachers to voice their experiences of subjectivity formation into a classroom assumes a sameness in implications of telling, thus not only levelling the categories 'student' and 'teacher', but perpetuating the notion that experiences of those in nondominant groups, whether students or teachers, can be absorbed in their entirety through their telling. I argue that when voice, subjectivity, and resistance are recognized to be embodied or "materialized" (Butler 1993), it is possible to begin to reconceptualize the student-teacher dyad.

To indicate that voices are embodied is another way of signifying that speaking voices emanate from embodied subjectivities. 'Voice', then, also signifies a claim to an understanding of one's subjectivity. In Chapter Three, I explore implications of 'voice' as subjectivity by taking up examples from my own subjectivity formation while considering complexities of what is at stake in a prescription to voice experiences of subjectivity formation into classrooms as an emancipatory strategy.

The presentation of Chapter Four is in part intended as a performance of repetitive performativities of the materialization of sex, race, sexuality, and class in order to expose the status quo as repetitious artifice. I intend these repetitions to show that both those disrupting and repeating the status quo *resist*. In doing so, I resist the notion that *resistance* is possible only by students to teachers in classrooms and unproblematized by race, gender, class, or sexuality politics. Resistance understood in this way makes it possible to deconstruct, from yet another angle, the teacher-student binary.

Chapter One

INTERROGATING CREATIVE PEDAGOGIES

In the borderlands
you are the battleground
where enemies are kin to each other;
you are at home, a stranger,
the border disputes have been settled
the volley of shots have shattered the truce
you are wounded, lost in action
dead, fighting back....

To survive the Borderlands
you must live *sin fronteras*
be a crossroads
(Anzaldua 1987, 194, 195)

All education has political implications and very often its practitioners have political intentions. Frequently, education is taken up by individuals in pursuit of social mobility, supported by a culture invested in the preservation of a status quo of social hierarchy. Pedagogy in this context consists of transmitting information designated to be important for securing and maintaining social status.

I wish to engage with a different notion of pedagogy which 'originates' with those pedagogues who situate themselves within what I refer to as creative pedagogies--those pedagogies which are critical, liberatory, feminist, queer, postmodern, postcolonial, environmental, peace and/or revolutionary. What creative pedagogies have in common is their explicitly *political* imperative of education for social change--education which is disruptive of the status quo. In terms which I take up later, this political imperative is directed toward the "releasing" of "subjugated knowledges"[1] (Foucault 1980b, 85), inititating a challenge to tradition and a possibility for social transformation.

I offset 'originate' above to mark this term as a political problematic. Claims to originality miss noticing that knowledge is historical and shared and that those who author texts often have access to superior resources. Moreover, such claims obscure that an 'originary' text can only originate by virtue of other texts which are not made explicit--those which are subjugated, submerged, silent or absent. In this chapter, I examine writings of creative pedagogues, including, for example, Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux, Patti Lather, Anne-Louise Brookes, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Deborah Britzman, Simon Watney, Rey Chow, Leslie Roman, Chandra Mohanty, bell hooks, and Cornell West in order to set the stage in subsequent chapters for an exploration of the implications of three components which are often not made explicit even in creative pedagogies; or when made explicit, not problematized; or when problematized, still problematic. These components are: i) embodied voices in classrooms; ii) implications of voicing experiences of subjectivity as a central emancipatory strategy; and iii) the significance and role of resistance in classrooms.

I have necessarily been selective in the work that I take up in this chapter. The area of creative pedagogy is burgeoning with books and articles--work I could not possibly address in its entirety. This is part of the dilemma of the postmodern intellectual attempting to contend with an information explosion, written and now electronic. My reasons for selecting those authors I did select are many. Freire is too important a thinker historically and contemporarily to leave out--his work has influenced generations of those who care passionately about teaching and learning, myself included. Giroux is included because he is a prolific writer who has had considerable input into a range of pedagogical topics. The feminist scholars were particularly difficult for me to select. I wanted to include all of them because of my intellectual debt to feminist scholarship and because I know that this work is often ignored or villified, and rarely referenced outside feminist circles. While I take up Brookes and Lather specifically, my thesis contains voices of many feminist scholars with diverse embodiments. My selection of work which attempts to understand 'race' reflects my interest in feminist postmodern or feminist post-colonial writing and consequently includes bell hooks, Gayatri Chakrovorty Spivak and Rey Chow. While race is the most salient feature I have borrowed from these writers, each situates herself in other important ways as well. The queer pedagogy work that I include reflects the writings which are only recently becoming a part of the critical assessment of pedagogy. At this historical moment, windows of 'opportunity' have made it possible for only some 'queer' bodies to move out of one closet into other closets of meaning.

---

[1] Foucault wrote that "subjugated knowledge" owes its "force...to the harshness with which it is opposed by everything surrounding it" (Foucault 1980b, 85).

By excavating relevant texts from these selected creative pedagogues, not only do connections and borrowings emerge, revealing the indebtedness of these authors to others' work and experiences, but absences become apparent, exposing ways in which other submerged subjectivities, experiences, and resistances prop up these works.

Yet, creative work must start somewhere. As I begin, I am aware that I am implicated in an arbitrary starting point which itself relies on exclusions, and that I am in debt to those whose texts I now explore.

Creative Pedagogues

Paulo Freire

Paulo Freire stands out as one of the most influential creative pedagogues. He has been called "the greatest living educator, a master and teacher, first among a dying class of modern revolutionaries who fight for social justice and transformation" (Taylor 1993, 1). Indeed, in some circles Freire has attained an almost cultic status.

> Paulo Freire is the exemplary organic intellectual of our time. If Antonio Gramsci had not coined this term, we would have to invent it to describe the revolutionary character and moral content of the work and life of Paulo Freire. (West 1993, xiii)

Freire also has critics, even among other creative pedagogues. Rockhill writes, for example, that "discourses about literacy, whether about power, skill or social relations, are strangely silent on the questions of gender and of women" (Rockhill 1987, 7). Taylor echoes this criticism in his "Notes on Language and Sexism" and as well makes explicit the unacknowledged multi-layered Euro-western, Christian influences masquerading as universalized concepts in Freire's written work (Taylor 1993). Scribner identifies problematics of the "great divide in intellectual abilities between those who have and those who have not mastered written language" (Scribner 1984, 14) as this underwrites literacy education in both industrialized and under-industrialized[2] countries based on modernization models of economic development.[3]

Notwithstanding the spectrum of praise and criticism, the work and life of Freire has produced a rich and burgeoning literature related to emancipatory pedagogy, detailed initially by Freire in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. It is this text that I use as a starting point in my representation of Freire's unique pedagogy.[4] Although Freire actively wrote and worked with his model of pedagogy for years, it was not until the English publication of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in 1970 that he gained widespread acclaim outside his own milieu of primarily Portuguese reading educators in South America, particularly Brazil.

Freire framed *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* within a distinction between oppressed and oppressors, in which the oppressed are the poor and the oppressors are the rich and middle class; an understanding of the politics of social status; and the imperative for social change. The context within which Freire was writing and working was and continues to be one of extreme poverty with a high degree of illiteracy among the poor.[5]

---

[2] The idea of 'under-industrialized' as with the notion of 'under-developed' holds currency within models of progress as formulated by 'first' world countries. These models advocate the need for countries designated as 'under' to aspire and develop on a model of industry attributed to first world countries. A different way of looking at this would be to ascribe the characteristics 'over-developed' and 'over-industrialized' to 'first' world countries, thus problematizing notions of progress. Given environmental and economic degradation, 'under'-development may have more to offer the global village than western notions of 'progress'.

[3] For critiques of a development models within a modernist paradigm, see, for example, Hicks (1988); Hayter and Watson (1984); George (1987); and Brandt (1980).

[4] For other texts by Freire see, Freire (1974; 1978) and Freire and Macedo (1987) and Freire and Faundez (1989).

Freire posed an opposition between what he referred to as a banking concept of education as a source of oppression and his problem-solving model in which he thought "conscientization" and therefore humanization would occur. According to Freire, the banking model is essentially a narrative relationship between teacher and student which

> involves a narrating Subject (teacher) and patient, listening objects (the students). The contents, whether values or empirical dimensions of reality, tend in the process of being narrated to become lifeless and petrified. Education is suffering from narration sickness....The teacher talks about reality...his task is to "fill" the student with the contents of his narration--contents which are detached from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could give them significance...education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. (Freire 1983, 57, 58)

Problem-solving or liberating education (Freire 1983, 67) involves the dissolution of the teacher-student contradiction through dialogical relations in which teacher and students work cooperatively in the consideration of humans in relation with the world. Both teacher-student and student-teacher "simultaneously reflect on themselves and the world" (Freire 1983, 70) and in this way become more fully aware or conscious of themselves as humans. Freire thought that "problem-posing education affirms men as beings in the process of *becoming*--as unfinished, uncompleted beings and with a likewise unfinished reality" (Freire 1983, 72). According to Freire, a deepening awareness ensues which moves individuals toward greater consciousness of their humanity--a process he referred to as "conscientization". In and through this process individuals are humanized, while in the banking model individuals become dehumanized (Freire 1983, 74).

---

[5] While Freire does not use statistics in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, information for Sao Paulo is used in various dialogues throughout other texts; for example, *Pedagogy of the City* (1993). The Postscript in this text contains figures for 1992 revealing that "even though two million are enrolled in three school districts in elementary education in particular, approximately 400,000 children between the ages of seven through fourteen have not yet gone to school" (Freire 1993, 151).

Freire and the Subject

It was Freire's deep and abiding passion that those he labelled the "oppressed" should become Subjects--the upper case 'S' signifying a belief in a universal human Subject. While he associates the notion of a Subject with teachers in his definition of a banking model of education (Freire 1989, 57), Freire states that liberatory education reconciles the traditional contradiction of this relationship through dialogue in which the teacher as Subject becomes teacher-student and student as Object becomes student-teacher, thus de-centering both teachers and students from those roles held within traditional pedagogies. In this way

> those who, in learning to read and write, come to a new awareness of *selfhood* and begin to look critically at the social situation in which they find them*selves*, often take the initiative in acting to transform the society that has denied them this opportunity of participation. (Freire 1983, 9, emphasis added)

Indeed, for Freire, "the disinherited masses in Latin America are awakening from their traditional lethargy and are anxious to participate, as Subjects" (Freire 1983, 9). Critical awareness of selfhood for Freire is linked and integral to the notion of achieving status as Subject.

Freire attributes Subject status to teachers in both the banking model and his own liberatory model and to students only in his liberatory model. He writes, for example, that the relationship between teachers and students in the banking model is that of the teacher as "narrating Subject" and students as "patient, listening objects" (Freire 1983, 57). In his model, "teachers and students...are both Subjects, not only in the task of unveiling...reality, and thereby coming to know it critically, but in the task of re-creating that knowledge" (Freire 1983, 56). It is only through a process of what Freire calls "humanization" that students can achieve Subject status, already apparently available to teachers in both models. It is not clear, however, how teachers, as oppressors, in the banking model achieve humanized Subject status. The commonality of teacher as Subject within the banking model and the problem-solving model throws into question what characteristics students are to assume as Subjects in Freire's model. If there is a universal Subject, how do student-teachers, when becoming Subjects, avoid the Subjectivity Freire links with oppressors? Why is it that teachers in the banking model are already Subjects, seemingly devoid of dehumanization? By virtue of casting the teacher-student as Subject who invites the student into dialogue in order for the student to become a Subject as student-teacher, dialogic pedagogy is reconfigured as paternalism. A situation of I-doing-for-others is played out, making difficult critical awareness of ways in which the invitation to liberation becomes another act of oppression.

If, as Freire states, "functionally, oppression is domesticating" (Freire 1989, 36), it is important to reconceptualize Freirean pedagogy to account both for macro-level and micro-level analyses, in order to notice that configuration of self-other is important to analysis of teacher-student relationships. This reveals ways in which both students and teachers may be implicated in oppressive structures and practices--not only those of the teacher-student dyad but those which sustain systems of oppression for 'others' both inside and outside the learning environment. If we take Freire seriously when he writes: "participation involves a more active presence of the subordinate classes in history, instead of their mere representation" (Freire 1993, 70), is it not necessary to find ways to include the active presence of students rather than merely their re-presentation by teachers-learners within both pedagogical texts and the context of pedagogical practice? Despite Freire's concern to do away with a banking model of education (Paul Taylor writes that Freire's language of possibility is limited by the practice of his method, which in Taylor's words is a weak banking model [Taylor 1993, 70-73]), his model is nevertheless a deficit model in which students are posited as lacking, in this case lacking in conscientization and humanization. Freire's model does not allow a way to see oppressors as *lacking* by virtue of their oppressiveness.[6]

While Freire's liberatory model of teacher-students and student-teachers is an improvement over those pedagogies which assume no overlapping characteristics between teachers and students, he does not consider that there are a number of intersections that students and teachers may have in common. Part of the reason Freire is unable to differentiate subject positions more carefully is that he relies on a notion of a "Rational Man" in which subjectivity is assumed to be unified. Rational Man is a unified subject-self which, as I explore later, does not stand up to post-structuralist challenges which expose subjectivity as multiple, competing and complicated by processes such as racialization, genderization, and sexualization.[7] Is it possible for all students, or all teachers, or all the oppressed to assume a common subject position--a subject position implicated in modernist notions of rational, humanist 'man'?

---

[6] Positing 'lack of' with the Other is a common strategy within dominant discourses (the oppressed lack resources, women lack a phallus....). It is my contention that everyone is lacking in something; what needs to be interrogated is what is lacking, lacking to whom, and whether it matters.

Freire's modernist, humanist Subject is implicated as well in, what has been called, in some feminist work, phallocentric thought (Rockhill 1987; Campioni and Grosz 1991). For Campioni and Grosz phallocentrism is a deep, subtle presence which designates "systems of representation that collapse the two sexes into a single (implicitly masculine) model, identifying male interests with human interests" (Campioni and Grosz 1991, 393). As Kathleen Rockhill points out, Freire is silent about gender and women. This silence exposes a male-gendered Subject as central to Freire's work.

---

[7] Reference to *processes* of differentiation rather than categories of gender, race, class, sexuality, "*etc.*" underscores the ways in which these categories are produced and not fixed. But as importantly, noting that there are numerous and overlapping processes of differentiation helps avoid what Judith Butler calls the "embarassed 'etc.'" (Butler 1991, 143): "The theories of feminist identity that elaborate predicates of color, sexuality, ethnicity, class, and ablebodiedness invariably close with an embarassed 'etc.' at the end of the list. Through this horizontal trajectory of adjectives, these positions strive to encompass a situated subject, but invariably fail to be complete....This is a sign of exhaustion as well as of the illimitable process of signification itself" (Butler 1991, 143).

Positing a unified Subject is a common problem for class-based theories in which Subjects are thought to be formed by economic oppression only. Subjectivity formation is an effect of economic oppression but not only economic oppression: processes of racialization, genderization, and sexualization affect subjectivity formation as well. It is not sufficient to apply only an economic analysis in an attempt to understand how subjectivity is formed under oppressive circumstances.

Freire and Dialoguing Voices

Freire's understanding of oppression was framed by experiences with poverty and with imprisonment in Brazil and later exile in Chile (Freire 1993, 55). The latter experiences were an effect of the perception by those in authority that his work was revolutionary and radical and therefore threatening to the government of Brazil.[8] Freire located individual experience at the center of knowledge creation, highlighting the importance to pedagogy of the everyday of student experience. He wrote that "all of us [must] have the freedom and opportunity to create knowledge from our own experience" (Freire 1993, 9). This was a significant shift: indeed, a challenge to traditional modes of thinking and the canonized content of pedagogical practice.

According to Freire, naming experience is central to liberatory pedagogy: "to say one's words is to name one's world therefore to win back one's own world" (Freire 1993, 13). Both experience and naming (what I refer to as voicing) experience are situated and embodied.

---

[8] See Paul V. Taylor's *The Texts of Paulo Freire* (1993) in which he discusses Freire's experiences of poverty and exile.

> The importance of the body is indisputable; the body moves, acts, rememorizes the struggle for its liberation; the body, in sum, desires, points out, announces, protests, curves itself, rises, designs and remakes the world. (Freire 1993, 86-7)

Voicing experience occurs in what Freire refers to as a *dialogic* process of conscientization. He considered "dialogue [to be] an existential necessity" which in a pedagogical context could not "be reduced to the act of one person's 'depositing' ideas in another, nor...become a simple exchange of ideas to be 'consumed' by the discussants" (Freire 1989, 77). In the banking model, "[i]nstead of communicating, the teacher issues communiques and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat....the teacher talks and the students listen--meekly" (Freire 1989, 58, 59).

Freire believed that students should not sit silently while someone else names the world for them. He considers experience in which the consciousness of the oppressed is submerged and "the boss is inside them" (Freire 1989, 36, 51) to be "domesticating". This domestication, he said, prevents the oppressed from engaging in a process of inquiry about material conditions in which they are living their lives. Denial of this experience, Freire thought, is a kind of violence (Freire 1989, 73); violence against oneself and violence by those who deny anyone's experiences of oppression. He thought that students must voice "a true word...to transform the world...to exist, humanly, is to *name* the world, to change it" (Freire 1989, 75, 76). "True words" by those who want to name the world can transform reality while inauthentic words by those who do not wish this naming makes dialogue impossible.

Significantly, Freire wished to disrupt assumptions about teachers as knowledgeable and students as ignorant: "the teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he justifies his own existence....Education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers *and* students" in dialogue (Freire 1989, 58, 59).

The importance of Freire's attention to the opposition between teacher and student should not be underestimated, since this dyad has been largely taken for granted by writers both before and after Freire. My concerns are primarily with the workability of a dialogue between teachers and students when teachers are already assumed to have achieved Subject status and students are only working toward it. As well, while Freire thinks it important to disrupt the teacher/student dyad, he does not consider diversity among teachers and students, implying, then, that each category is monolithic. By not attending to this, Freire is unable to consider the problematics and the importance of dialogue between students, or between teachers and students. What makes dialogue difficult or impossible may have more to do with processes such as racialization or genderization than it has with a contradiction between teacher and student categories.

Freire's reliance on 'truth', 'reality', and 'authenticity' open a number of questions about the assumed unitariness of these notions. How, for example, will one know when she or he is engaged in an 'authentic' dialogue? Freire does not notice that it is possible that 'authenticity' is often determined from the position of those who exercise more power, congratulating themselves for 'dialoguing' even while "marginalizing or silencing" those who exercise less power (Young 1989, 257). Moreover, the goal of an 'authentic dialogue' assumes that it is possible and desirable for everyone to join a dialogue; that there are ways of experiencing the world that are commensurable; and that voicing one's reality as, for example, a subaltern[9], can be accomplished without capitulating to those who have determined the terms and conditions of the dialogue.

Freire and Resistance to Structure

While creative pedagogues are indebted to Freire's insight about the importance of experience to pedagogy, it is nevertheless necessary to make explicit Freire's interest in those experiences shared as a result of economic oppression, thus subjugating other experiences. This, in turn, framed how he conceptualized resistance. Resistance, according to Freire, is constitutive of the entire model of "pedagogy *of* the oppressed". Freire's model is directed at the empowerment of the oppressed as student-teachers in order to resist economic structures of inequality. A pedagogy of the oppressed intends to empower individuals towards awareness of and resistance to their class position within a socio-economic hierarchy.

---

[9] Gayatri Spivak asks "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988). Rey Chow writes: "The subaltern cannot speak not because there are not activities in which we can locate a subaltern mode of life/culture/subjectivity, but because...'speaking' itself belongs to an already well-defined structure and history of domination" (Chow 1993, 35-36).

While resistance to class and economic domination is an important form of resistance, a pedagogy focussed on this may miss seeing other ways in which student-teachers may wish to resist or are already resisting. Freire is able to focus on resistance to economic domination by virtue of ignoring resistances to other processes which oppress, for example, processes of racialization, genderization, and sexualization. It may not be unequivocally true that literacy education, indeed education of any kind, can have the liberating effects that Freire called for if resistance is understood only in relation to macro-level structures outside the classroom.

Freire notes that student-learners may become oppressors themselves, thus exposing their false consciousness. This false consciousness is in part manifested in a resistance *to* the pedagogy of the oppressed rather than a resistance to economic domination. Yet, casting resistance *to* pedagogy as false consciousness opens up the possibility of casting any resistance to pedagogy, including those resistances to racist or misogynist pedagogies, as false-consciousness as well.

Henry Giroux--Border Crossings Between Theories

One of the foremost creative pedagogues writing and working in the field of critical pedagogy and cultural studies today is Henry Giroux. His prolific writings include *Postmodernism, Feminism, and Cultural Politics* (1991), *Border Crossings* (1992), *Disturbing Pleasures* (1994), as well as edited books like *Between Borders* (1994); and many articles.

Giroux came from a white working-class background in the United States. He won a basketball scholarship to college and, through the scholarship, made it into academia as a token upwardly mobile person from the lower classes, thus becoming an exemplar of the American dream. Later, Giroux was denied tenure for his controversial work synthesizing educational theory with cultural studies theory which challenged traditional educational scholarhip grounded in "dominant functionalism" (Aronowitz & Giroux 1993, 164). Thus for Giroux, like Freire before him, his experiences shape his knowledg(ed) claims about the practice of pedagogy.

In his groundbreaking article "Crossing the Boundaries of Educational Discourse: Modernism, Postmodernism, and Feminism" (Giroux 1992a), Giroux elaborates why he thinks that educational theory is an important arena of cultural studies. According to Giroux modernism, postmodernism, and feminism bring together discursive practices that are "capable of extending and theoretically advancing a radical politics of democracy" (Giroux 1992a, 42). Each by itself is theoretically inadequate and taken together they are intra and inter textually contradictory and ideologically diverse. However Giroux writes:

> [W]hen posited in terms of the interconnection between both their differences and the common ground they share for being mutually correcting, they offer a rich theoretical and political opportunity for rethinking the relationship between schooling and democracy. (Giroux 1992a, 42)

The unfinished democraticization of all sectors of global culture is taken from modernism and fused with the political and ethical dimensions of postmodern feminisms. Melded with these is a further connection to the postmodernist endorsement of difference, partiality, situatedness, and non-innocent knowledges.

When woven together, Giroux believes that pedagogy can be expanded into the word and world of cultural politics.

Giroux and Wandering Selves, Situated Others

Giroux is critical of the tendency of modernist writers to posit identities or subjectivities as universals, metanarratives and oppositions (Giroux 1992a, 55). For Giroux subjectivities are formed in and through those range of "multiple narratives and 'border' crossings" identified by postmodernist thinkers (Giroux 1992a, 54). Border crossings refer to crossings back and forth between those modernist categories which have been closed as if unified and forged in binary systems of race, gender, sex, class, sexual orientation, age, able-bodiedness, ethnicity, and religion ("*etc.*"). The binaries created within these closed systems privilege one side and misrepresent or absent the opposite. The misrepresented or absent Other is mythologized as less important or lacking by comparison to the dominant category, while identity formation on both sides of the binary depends on maintenance of the binary. Border crossings occur either unconsciously[10] or actively as a result of an awareness of the constructedness, arbitrariness, and permeability of subjectivities/identities forged as either/or.[11]

---

[10] In Chapter Four I return to how the unconscious plays a role in resistance. I am interested in those unconscious resistances to dominant cultures by those who are normalized and who cross borders, say, between the hetero and the homo while not spelling out to themselves that they are border crossing. As well, I am interested in ways in which those who have not spelled out to themselves that their embodiment, as, say, homosexual, is a resisting embodiment, even though they are not consciously political about this resistance.

As pernicious as fixing identities is the privilege which accrues to one side of the binary, producing a relation of domination. Crossing borders shows how "difference holds out the possibility of not only bringing the voices and politics of the Other to the center of power, but also understanding how the center is implicated in the margins" (Giroux 1992a, 58). Marginalization of the Other in dominant discourses through misrepresentation or no representation permits a dominant subjectivity whose voice and politics are constituted by privilege in relation to the margin. Yet, subjectivity is only fixed or frozen in the modernist presumptions of the language of classification. In Chapter Three I explore processes which operate in overlapping, contradictory, and multiple ways thereby creating hybrid fluid subjectivities.

Giroux's understanding of the subject constructed in border crossings requires a critical pedagogy whose educators are "transformative intellectuals" aware of and occupying "specific political and social locations" (Giroux 1992a, 78). Giroux's call for a critical pedagogy is a call for educators to use their position *as educators* in a responsible way. In this way the self[12] must be seen as a primary site of politicization, embracing "Foucault's model of the specific intellectual who acknowledges the politics of personal location" (Giroux 1992a, 79).

---

[11] A deconstruction of the either/or--the way in which the Other of a binary operates to define both sides--reveals how subjectivities are constituted by their excluded other(s). To be included in the category White, for example, requires that one is different from those in the category Black. Recognizing Black is included in the category White by definition, breaks down the binary opposites which then no longer exercise the same force. I say more about deconstruction in Chapter Two.

[12] A notion of 'multiple selves' rather than 'subjectivities' is controversial even within writings by postmodernists. Those influenced by psychoanalytic theory take up the concepts of 'consciousness', 'unconsciousness', 'id', 'ego', and 'superego', all of which may be viewed as fragments of a core self (Flax 1990), or competing selves (Rorty 1986).

For Giroux, the call for recognition of the processes of subject formation as well as the fluidity of shifting, changing identities is fundamental to new understandings of relations of domination and local, regional and global networks of oppression. Yet he compresses subjectivities into the categories 'student', 'teacher', and 'transformative intellectuals', maintaining the teacher-student binary. Giroux sees teachers as transformative intellectuals, politicized in a process of transforming others who are students. The responsibility of transformative intellectuals is the invention of a new language and theories in which space is created for "themselves [transformative], their students [Other], and audiences [Others] to rethink their experiences" (Giroux 1992a, 79). He does not consider that a call for education to constitute a site for transformative intellectuals to responsibly locate and self-reflexively interrogate might include all the actors within this cultural setting. Nor does he consider that students are also politicized subjectivities--that students are also transformative intellectuals and cultural workers, actively involved in transforming themselves (even if this is to maintain the status quo), not just passive recipients of transformation processes.

In his call for self-critique and social critique, Giroux effectively constructs a Student-Other in relation to his Self-I-Transformative Intellectual. He formulates a pedagogy that depends upon a teacher-student dualism that fixes 'transformative' and 'cultural' as privileged attributes of teachers. It does not seem to occur to Giroux that in any given classroom, some students are the transformative intellectuals and that the teacher may be transformed nor does he consider that the educator may be the one frozen into political indifference, preserving the status quo. He does not entertain the possibility of fluid, shifting, changing 'teacher' and 'student' identities.

Unacknowledged within Giroux's pedagogy is the assumption that the teacher is the authority and the student is not. Giroux does not critique the asymmetrical privileges which accrue to teachers by virtue of the assumption that they are more knowledgeable. Giroux's self-I is in a position of privileged authority over those he has categorized Student--his Others. While Giroux is careful about noticing institutional processes which, for example, contribute to the racialization and genderization of students, he does not notice processes which 'studentize' students. Even as Giroux takes up the postmodern position of the importance of acknowledging differences, he levels differences within the categories 'teacher' and 'student'.

Giroux and Voicing Experiences of Subjectivity

Echoing Paulo Freire, Giroux understands experience to be central to pedagogy. Breaking with modernist notions of a sharp distinction between high and low culture and embracing the postmodern melding of the two, Giroux sees the everyday of students as worthy of serious study. The everyday is made apparent through telling experiences of, for example, movies, skateboarding, comics, harlequin romances and other forms of popular culture. In this way experience is "grounded in the contexts and specificities of people's lives, communities and cultures" (Giroux

1992a, 67), and the relationship between the personal and political is dismantled as well.

While the telling of formative experiences is important, Giroux emphasizes that it is crucial that students reject all forms of essentialism. There is a requirement to rethink "experience in terms that both name relations of oppression and also offer ways in which to overcome them" (Giroux 1992a, 79). Part of understanding the processes which shape identity consists in not only narrating one's own experiences but also analysing how particular experiences come to happen to one in the way that they do. This allows an insight into the multiple and often competing discourses which shape experience which, in turn, opens up the possibility of a recognition of the unfairness of processes which both create and privilege certain experiences.

Giroux thinks that a "politics of voice" must operate within critical pedagogy settings. This "politics of voice" is not to "simply affirm the stories that students tell, nor to simply glorify the possibility for narration" (Giroux 1992a, 80). A politics of voice must provide the setting and opportunity. Indeed, a politics of voice must be an active interrogation of the social, intersubjective and collective as these intersect within narratives. For Giroux, the dangers of unproblematized experience cannot be underestimated:

> [I]n some cases, educational criticism itself has been transformed into a reductionistic celebration of experience that resurrects the binary opposition between theory and practice, with the later becoming an unproblematic category for invoking the voice of pedagogical authority. (Giroux 1992a, 2)

Theorizing experience is a part of a larger "politics of engagement" (Giroux 1992a,

80) and closes the false gap between theory and practice.

Specific questions must be asked of narratives as these are interrogated, according to Giroux. In particular, it is necessary to question whether a narrative facilitates or silences the narration of other experiences. Taking seriously the meanings students assign to experience requires an understanding that experiences are embodied effects of processes of dichotomized differentiation in which one half of the binary is privileged. Critical analysis of cultural practice requires understanding that lived experiences are produced within asymmetrical relations of power. Thus, Giroux claims that in acknowledging the value of student voices narrating experience, it is possible to enable voices of subjugated Others. He writes: "to acknowledge the voices of the other, and to legitimate and reclaim student experience as a fundamental category in the production of knowledge" (Giroux 1992a, 95) reveals an absence of these voices as well as a refusal of dominant discourses and canon to be 'inclusive'. Hearing and then interrogating these narratives allows for the possibility that those from dominant cultures may understand how they are implicated within systems and processes of domination. The surfacing of subjugated knowledges, through the narration of experiences of oppression, informs critical awareness of the ways in which marginality at the level of everyday life lends itself to forms of opposition and resistance (Giroux 1992a, 103). This in turn facilitates the formation of a "transformative consciousness" (Giroux 1992a, 103).

It is not apparent how this call for narrating and interrogating experiences is taken up by Giroux himself and how he proposes that it be taken up by other educators. The self-reflexivity applied to students is not required of teachers. Giroux is not forthcoming about experiences which inform his understanding of relations of domination nor about processes involved in the formation of himself as a critical pedagogue at any given time. By not narrating his own experiences and how he understands them to have been produced, he sets up the expectation that only students are to narrate and interrogate experiences.[13] When only some experiences are in need of interrogation, the unacknowledged assumption is that Giroux and other creative pedagogues are universal signifiers to which students should aspire, leaving intact what Hebdige calls "the triangular formations of power and knowledge with the expert at the apex" (Hebdige 1989, 226). Moreover, as I discuss in Chapter Three, calling for the surfacing of subjugated knowledges in classrooms to facilitate questioning by those in dominant cultures does not adequately problematize the difficulties of surfacing these knowledges into racist, sexist, and homophobic classrooms.

Giroux and Resistance

One of the central tenets of creative pedagogies is that education should be concerned with social change to remove social inequalities. By fusing unrealized democracy with postmodernism and feminism within pedagogical practice Giroux argues that those designated Other are enabled to reclaim their own histories and voices. Arguing that 'difference' cannot be analyzed unproblematically, Giroux contends that resisting difference is to resist "those aspects of its ideological legacy used in the service of exploitation and subordination" (Giroux 1992b, 206). According to Giroux, interrogation of the experience of those from dominating groups builds understanding, indeed critical awareness, of the need for resistance towards dominant cultural practices as well. In this way classroom practice becomes resistance to the status quo and the divisions inherent within present socio-cultural systems.

---

[13] I had to do major sleuthing to uncover a very few facts about Giroux's subject formation. I uncovered the story about his youth in *Disturbing Pleasures* (1994); information about his tenure denial in Aronowitz & Giroux, *Education Still Under Siege* (1993) and the fact of his whiteness from a picture on the back of *Disturbing Pleasures*.

Resistance to the status quo is possible in and through the proliferation of arguments and interventions (Giroux 1992a, 54). Surfacing subjugated knowledges and thus exposing the multiplicity of discursive practices helps subordinated and excluded groups to make sense of the world while disrupting dominating groups' interpretations of the world. Through power-sensitive discourse, students are offered new opportunities "to produce political and cultural vocabularies by which to define and shape their individual and collective identities" (Giroux 1992a, 56).

Giroux argues that even if students have not had marginal experiences, understanding difference as marginality has implications for the construction of multiple relations between the self and Other. Nurturing resistance to social inequalities in the classroom can take place at the margins, according to Giroux, with the marginalized, or at various points of entry, with those who are not marginalized. Ideally, a doubling action occurs. By speaking and representing themselves, the marginalized resist dominant discursive practices. Those from dominant cultures learn resistance through the interrogation of their own as well as marginalized experiences.

For Giroux, the point of understanding resistance is to identify "differences that make a difference" (Giroux 1992a, 69)--that is identifying those differences which, when compared to 'the normal', result in inequality. Following Joan Scott's deconstructive work on the equality/difference binary in which Scott shows that equality is the opposite of inequality, not the opposite of difference (Scott 1988), Giroux argues for a resistance to the implication that differences must translate into unequal access to resources.

Giroux thinks that resistance can be encouraged in classroom practice through the use of popular culture. In *Disturbing Pleasures* (1994b), Giroux illustrates how everyday experience can be interrogated through the lens of movies, Disney World, and the advertising strategies of Benetton. Popular culture can be utilized to interrogate ways in which desire is learned and these understandings can, in turn, be used as points of resistance. Moreover, processes of canonizing are rendered archaic--with each new group of students, there will be an ever changing content.

Giroux claims that critical resistance is the point of creative pedagogy; resistance is the praxis of a learning that will not tolerate social inequality. Resistance consists of uncovering hierarchies, their construction, what is included and excluded and therefore refusing their ultimate 'truth' (Giroux 1992a, 69). Yet, Giroux does not consider the possibility of resistance *to* the critical pedagogue. Using Giroux's own argument about resistance to hierarchy and taking into account the hierarchy of teacher and student, resistances will occur in the classroom against this hierarchy as yet another forced binary in which one half of the equation is elevated or privileged over the other.

Giroux understands "the university [to be] a place that produces a particular selection and ordering of narratives and subjectivities. It is, furthermore, a place that is deeply political and unarguably normative " (Giroux 1992a, 90). Yet, part of the ordering and normativity in universities is a process of what I call "studentization"--a process of becoming 'the good student'. There is also a process of becoming 'the good teacher'--a process of 'teacherization'. Just as processes of racialization are complicated by processes of, say, genderization, processes of 'studentization' and 'teacherization' are complicated by other processes of differentiation as well. What those who have been studentized have in common however, is reduced access by comparison to teachers of institutional resources including credibility. Resistance to processes of either 'studentization' or 'teacherization' often form subjectivities such as 'bad' students or 'bad' or 'unprofessional' teachers, producing inequalities not only between teachers and students, but between students and between teachers as well.

It is my contention that resistance *to* creative pedagogy does and should occur as an effect of unproblematized inequality in the teacher-student hierarchy, as well as unproblematized dynamics which arise between students. If Giroux is taken seriously, resistance towards any knowledged claim, even those presented by the critical pedagogues and 'good students', should be encouraged.

Situated Others

This section examines work of creative pedagogues who reflexively take up their own situatedness in their creative pedagogies. These pedagogues are situated differently from the norm, and hence unequally, within pedagogical practice. While the creative pedagogies of Freire and Giroux are also situated pedagogies, Freire and Giroux do not foreground their situatedness as critical observers of others' marginalization. The creative pedagogies explored in the sections which follow depend, in part, on a reflexive surfacing and problematizing of those experiences and knowledges which have been subjugated, as well as a critique of ways in which notions of the dominant and the normative are sustained. Feminist pedagogies are concerned with the subjugated knowledges of those who have been differentiated as 'women' and implications of this for the masculine/feminine binary in educational discourse; queer pedagogies focus on knowledges of those differentiated as 'queer' and the way in which this informs the hetero/homo binary in education; and race-ing pedagogies take up knowledges from those who have been racialized as other than white in order to interrogate implications of the white/nonwhite binary in educational practice.

Notions of what consititutes subjectivity, self, I, and Other are increasingly complicated when theories of pedagogy become raced, gendered and queered.[14] There are material embodied effects when "wandering selves" cross borders. Bodies designated as either teacher or student are constituted within overlapping processes of, for example, genderization, sexualization, and racialization. As I discuss below, noticing that other categories intersect with 'teacher' and 'student' renders problematic leaving 'teacher' and 'student' intact as educational signifiers of self. Moreover, accounting for various processes of differentiation in subjectivity formation, requires a nuancing of the voicing or telling of student experiences into classrooms. Not only does an invitation to 'voice' experiences level the effects of this requirement on those differentially situated, as I discuss below and in Chapter Three, this invitation obscures the fact that experiences exceed the categories and meanings imposed by those from dominant perspectives who hear the telling of these experiences.

---

[14] I contrast processes of differentiation, for example, processes of racialization, sexualization, and genderization with processes which *interrogate* ways in which racialization, sexualization and genderization occur. I call these processes of interrogation, for example race-ing, gendering, and queering.

Feminist Pedagogies

With the rise of Women's Studies programmes and feminist approaches to education in Faculties of Education in North America (Gore 1993), pedagogy has been taken up by feminist theorists. Feminist pedagogy is situated differently from the phallocentric discourse that predominates in western meta-narratives of education. While Freire and Giroux cannot be considered part of that tradition, since they problematize ways in which fixed categories mitigate against pedagogy for social change, neither adequately situates himself as male in a culture which privileges masculinity, thus leaving unacknowledged advantages which may have accrued to them by virtue of their masculinity. There is a significant difference between Giroux calling for the emergence of subjugated knowledges as a white man and a call for the emergence of subjugated knowledges of 'women' by those whose knowledges have been subjugated. The force of this difference is clear in Giroux's essay, "Border Pedagogy in the Age of Postmodernism" (1988), in which Giroux demonstrates an unwillingness to notice situated differences in experiences of critical pedagogy. Giroux accuses Elizabeth Ellsworth of "claiming rather self-righteously the primacy and singularity of her own ideological reading of what constitutes a political project" in response to Ellsworth's discussion of critical pedagogy in the context of her own experiences of teaching an anti-racism course. As Patti Lather writes, "feminist tendencies against vanguardism problematize the position of those 'transformative intellectuals' (Aronowitz and Giroux 1985) who assume a hegemony over what theory is and themselves as the locus of what can be known and done" (Lather 1991, xviii).

The Situated Subjectivity of Feminist Pedagogy

Two feminist works that take up the challenge of creative pedagogy are Patti Lather's *Getting Smart* (1988) and Anne-Louise Brookes's *Feminist Pedagogy* (1992). Lather describes her work as post-modernist feminist while Brookes identifies her text as feminist autobiography. How each takes up subjectivity is heavily influenced by these discursive practices. In keeping with feminist theory-practice, both see their work as highly politicized projects.

For Lather, 'subjectivity' reflects a "de-centred, refashioned site of disarray and conflict inscribed by multiple contestatory discourses" (Lather 1988, 5). She specifically calls for a shift away from universalizing spokespersons. As a consequence, she is interested in exploring her own interaction with her research project and her own reflective work on the politics of creating meaning (Lather 1988, 79). The question of what it means to decenter the self within the context of a feminism devoted to women and 'women' s self-knowledge' is a question with which Lather grapples.

Like Giroux, Lather wants critical educators to see themselves as cultural workers, thus breaking down barriers that prevent people from speaking for themselves (Lather 1988, ix). Yet, she unproblematically takes up references to 'teacher', 'student', 'researcher' and 'researched' as if these are universal categories. Even as she decenters her own subjectivity so that she becomes researched and researcher, she does not decenter subjectivity of students as the following statements reveal: "we consciously use our research to help participants understand and change their situations" (Lather 1988, 56); and "respondents gain self-understanding and ultimately self-determination" (Lather 1988, 58); researchers "need to empower the researched" (Lather 1988, 69). Assumptions are made about the group categorized as Student even as Lather realizes many of the problems with processes of differentiation. When the voices of students are included in Lather's text, the subjectivity or context of these voices is decontextualized, dehistoricized, and naturalized within the category Student.

Anne-Louise Brookes places herself centrally within her work; hers is a "a story about returning the self to the self" by reconnecting "with the self I had lost through abuse" (Brookes 1992, 2). Through a series of letters to thesis advisors, course essays, reworked essays, self-authored fictional work, responses to both essays and works of fiction, and her own own reflections on these, her story becomes her understanding of "myself as a subject producing this text" (Brookes 1992, 8).

Throughout her work, Brookes acknowledges herself as a split self in and through processes learned early in her life. These processes include sexual abuse and denial of this abuse. Brookes learned about 'herself' simultaneously through male abuse of her body and the submersion or disappearing of this knowledge from her social self at home, in school and elsewhere. The conscious and public uncovering of her silenced, abused self is Brooke's attempt to continue to learn how abuse informs her developing subjectivity as well as providing the force for her argument that there needs to be "academic reconsideration of writing and reading practices which work to keep relations of power and authority in place" (Brookes 1992, 5).

Brookes is clear in her text that she is exploring her own subjectivity even as she is exploring the "problem for women of how to locate our subjective social selves in our research" (Brookes 1992, 9). She is concerned that academic work and research has at its heart the effect of separating "us from ourselves, from each other and from the knowledge of our ideological formations" (Brookes 1992, 10). While the notion of self is contested by Brookes, the force of her argument is that the experience of abuse, and the surfacing of this particular kind of self involves the surfacing of a subjugated knowledge.

Lather and Brookes situate themselves within their work as white, middle-class and female yet don't pursue how this situatedness informs the questions they ask and the ways in which they address questions they do ask. Early in her text, Lather calls herself a "first-world woman...white, middle-class, North American, heterosexual...shift[ing] from post-Marxist feminist to postmodern materialist-feminist" which she refers to as "hybrid forms" (Lather 1991, xix). Yet, it is only as 'woman' that Lather foregrounds her subjectivity and not as white, middle class, or heterosexual as her text proceeds. Her work is identified as feminist pedagogy, as is that of Brookes, and not, for example, white feminist or heterosexual feminist pedagogy--'white' and 'heterosexual' are in the background as effaced or absent signifiers.

Even as Lather agrees that "the deck is stacked when one group takes it upon itself to develop the theory and then have the others criticize it" (Lather 1991, xviii), as I discuss below, those who situate themselves as Black or 'queer' *do* foreground these in their pedagogies and often must do so while critical of those who assume that their whiteness or heterosexuality does not inform their work.[15]

Voicing Genderized Experience

The role of experience has been central to North American feminism and to feminist pedagogy. "Consciousness raising" through the telling of experience has been identified by some as feminist method (Mackinnon 1982). 'Voicing' or telling experiences are important to both Brookes and Lather, while each recognizes that experience is not an innocent category upon which feminist theory may be built.

---

[15] In a note Lather indicates, "that I write from a position of heterosexual privilege is not unimportant, but 'heterosexual' feels a thin term and an unattractive kind of closure to the complexity of my life" (Lather 1991, 166n). The double negative of "not unimportant" brushes over ways in which heterosexual privilege *is important* to one's theorizing.

In writing about her own experience of sexual abuse, Brookes attempts to trace how she had learned not to know, doing what Foucault has described as a history of the present. Through this process of uncovering her unknowing of abuse, Brookes comes to understand her own experiences as well as the social illusions, practices, and ideologies created by social relations--the ways in which she continues to be controlled by her past through the continued shaping of her ongoing experience (Brooks 1992, 12). In and through her own processing of experience, Brookes understands that "women are collectively negated by a history shaped and formed by male experience" (Brooks 1992, 31). A doubling effect takes place as Brookes comes to problematize her own experience as well as the phallocentrism of experience that has served as an universal signifier for human experience.[16] Brookes' autobiographical telling of her experiences of abuse and the ways in which this abuse has been replicated in her education is a self-conscious 'voicing' of experiences which are so often forced into privacy. By voicing these experiences, by "breaking the silence" through autobiographical analysis, Brookes believes it possible to "reclaim my life" (Brookes 1992, 4).

Lather emphasizes the importance of genealogies which historicize and denaturalize any notion of 'women's experience'. She insists that "identity does not follow unproblematically from experience" (Lather 1991, 118). Lather argues for a postmodern foregrounding of the discursive shaping of our experiences (Lather 1991, 25), emphasizing that self-reflexive experience, that is problematized experience, is a basis for knowing (Lather 1991, 46).

---

[16] While it is important that Brookes identifies the falseness of phallocentrism embedded within much intellectual work following a eurowestern, christian tradition, the myth is triply problematic in that it is premised on a situated experience that only a small minority of those gendered male have had historically.

Patti Lather uses voice as a metaphor for speaking experiences and she critically examines an expectation that students are empowered by 'student voice'. Examples of voice in Lather's text include, for example: authoritative voice, plainspeaking voice, deconstructive voice, multiples voices, coming to voice, different voices, voice of the transcendental ego, intrusive voice, lived voice, and unvoiced or unheard voice. Lather concurs with Ellizabeth Ellsworth's problematization of the concept of 'voice' "evident in liberatory discourse in education" (Lather 1991, 43). Like Ellsworth, Lather is critical of the pluralist turn, exemplified by Freire and Giroux, which assumes that a dialogical community can be achieved in the classroom. Lather is sympathetic with the view, which I articulated in my discussion about Freire and 'authentic dialogue', that dialogue is not always a worthy goal. Attempting to achieve community in which all are invited to join the dialogue (Rooney 1989) assumes that it is desirable and possible for marginalized people to dialogue across differences. Expectations to voice marginalized situated experience into classrooms leaves one asking with Elizabeth Ellsworth, "why doesn't this feel empowering?" (1992).

Queer Pedagogies

The use of 'queer theory' to denote theorizing which privileges the homo in an attempt to deconstruct the hetero/homo binary has been attributed to Teresa de Lauretis. According to de Lauretis, "'Queer Theory' conveys a double emphasis--on the conceptual and speculative work involved in discourse production, and on the necessary critical work of deconstructing our own discourses and their constructed silences" (de Lauretis 1991, iv). De Lauretis goes on to say that:

> The term "queer"...was arrived at in the effort to avoid all of the fine distinctions [between different, nondominant sexualities] in our discursive protocols, not to adhere to any of the given terms, not to assume their ideological liabilities, but instead to transgress and transcend them--or at the very least problematize them. (de Lauretis 1991, v)

I take up the notion of 'queer' in this section as a way of understanding those creative pedagogies which call into question classroom practices which (hetero)normalize participants.

Queering Subjectivity

In "Is There a Queer Pedagogy?: Or, Stop Being [Acting?] Straight!", Deborah Britzman emphasizes queer pedagogy as opposed to a queer pedagogue. This shift underlines subjectivity as process rather than a fixed identity (Britzman 1993, 2) and effectively puts Britzman's subjectivity into motion as well. Britzman asks whether "pedagogy [can] move beyond producing essentialized subject positions and look at the fashioning of the self that occurs when attention is given to the production of the subject, identities and identifications studied, and subject positions made possible and impossible in such a study (Britzman 1993, 3). Following Jonathan Boyarin (1992), Britzman contends that "the history of othering is a history of reading" (Britzman 1993, 2) and that normalizing pedagogical practice is learning to mis-read or what Britzman calls bad reading practices.

In *School's Out*, Simon Watney considers the "immediate legal and ideological circumstances that frame the subject of homosexuality in schools" (Watney 1994, 166). The notion of "framing the subject" is, according to Foucault, an acknowledgement that the subject is "subject to someone else's control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self knowledge" (Foucault 1984, 420). Watney analyzes recent British legislation, Section 28 and the "Wolfenden Strategy", that seeks to rigidly define "acceptable" human sexuality within the confines of reproductive heterosexual marriage.

> Indeed, it is vitally important that lesbians and gay men should be able to understand the mechanisms of displacement and denial that inform heterosexual projections about us as people, for these projections determine the world in which we must live our lives. (Watney 1994, 170)

For Watney, the *pedagogic value* of gay culture is understanding ways in which gay identities are developed and sustained in the face of repressive legislation that viciously misrepresents gay subjectivities.

Both Watney and Britzman explore processes of normalization of the self into a subjectivity of heteronormativity (Britzman) or a subject position of heterosexuality (Watney); each emphasizes ways in which pathologizing of homosexuality is embedded within heteronormative subjectivity; and both are self-conscious of effects of pathologization of homosexuality on their own subjectivities.

Identification as queer subject places the heteronormative as Other. This is an 'othering' with a difference. It is a "deconstructive revolt" (Spivak 1991, x) in which heterosexuality is illuminated as a production of both normalized-heterosexual and abnormalized-homosexual bodies. Casting heteronormativity as Other is a strategic move exposing the artifice of the hetero-homo binary--how in a context of heteronormativity heterosexuality 'goes without saying'.

For Britzman and Watney, the inclusion of queered bodies into the text of pedagogical theory disrupts the monolithic notion of 'student' and 'teacher' since it is possible to further differentiate both students and teachers by their 'queerness'.

Queering Voice

A common experience of lesbian and gay students and teachers is pedagogical practice which reinforces that "homosexuality is beyond consideration"--a denial of the existence of those whose experience is in part formulated as lesbian or gay (Watney 1994, 167). Britzman wishes, however, to shift away from "old formulas of experience as telling and hence as transparent and role models as the transitional object to self esteem" (Britzman 1993, 7). Britzman is more interested in a genealogy of experiences of normalization, since the production of abnormalcy can only be understood in relation to an understanding of the formulation of normalcy. Queer pedagogy, according to Britzman, is an examination of bad reading practices set into place through "the production of normalcy" which, in its effects, produces lesbian and gay male experiences as deviant Other (Britzman 1993, 9).

Watney presents experiences of homosexuality in a much more personal sense, grounding his observations in his own memories of how "the subject of homosexuality only existed as a pretext for sniggers and insult" (Watney 1994, 167). Like Britzman, Watney emphasizes ways in which homosexual experiences of homophobia and heterosexism can be understood as effects of experiences of heteronormativity. Thus experience is problematized and doubled on itself revealing the relations of domination at the heart of the great divide of hetero-homo (Sedgewick 1990, 40) and how this in turn, informs educational politics when pedagogy is queered.

Focussing on the voicing of experiences of heteronormativity, rather than on voicing experiences of marginalization shifts responsibility for interrogation of processes of differentiation onto the normalized--the privileged. While this is a significant reversal of what might be interpreted as an imperative to 'come to voice' in classrooms of creative pedagogues, in Chapter Three I consider whether this process can be initiated without a prompt from the voicing of subjugated experiences.

Race-ing Pedagogies

I borrow the notion of 'race-ing' from Toni Morrison's book *Race-ing Justice, En-gendering Power: Essays on Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas, and the Construction of Social Reality* (1992). Morrison uses 'race-ing' to designate a critical examination of racism. I take up the notion of 'race-ing' to capture the work of those whose pedagogy calls into question processes of racialization.

Race-ing Subjectivity

Those engaged in race-ing pedagogy attempt to create an understanding that everyone is racialized and to disrupt 'white' as a stable, universal signifier. Whereas queer pedagogy takes up processes of normalization with respect to heteronormativity, race-ing pedagogy takes up processes of normalization with respect to white-normativity. Numerous writers are engaged in this intellectual project; for example, bell hooks, Cornell West, Leslie G. Roman, Richard Hatcher and Barry Troyna. Other writers problematize the racialization of pedagogy through post-colonial theory: Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Rey Chow, Edward Said, and Chandra Mohanty.

In "White is a Color!" (1993), Leslie G. Roman discusses the tendency to treat "race as a reified synonym for racially subordinate groups" (Roman 1993, 73). Similarly, Chandra Mohanty describes the management of race on campuses in the United States as a way of containing, managing, and further marginalizing those raced as Other-than white within pathologized categories that saturate academic discourse, including pedagogical practice (Mohanty 1994). Managing race operates to "domesticate race and difference by formulating the problems in narrow, interpersonal terms and by rewriting historical contexts as manageable psychological ones" (Mohanty 1994, 157). Individuals raced as Other-than white are signified as problematic; that is too sensitive, too fussy, not smart or not productive enough. A few are assigned star status and allowed to represent the whole field as token. As Spivak warns, this allows for the welcoming of "selective inhabitants of the margin in order to better exclude the margin" (Spivak 1988, 107).

Race-ing pedagogy uncovers the processes that produce white subjects and subjects Other-than white. In this way race becomes a significant element in the lives of all students not just those selves fixed as "pathological" (Hatcher & Troyna 1993, 123). This "deconstructive revolt" throws the normalization of 'white' into relief as a problematic category. Focus shifts to a problematizing of the normalizing of white experience and subjectivity, a move that turns the table on problematizing, managing, and containment of those coded Other-than white. 'Whiteness' is recognized as the category in need of management, one deeply embedded within oppressive pedagogical practices.

Race-ing pedagogy also permits an understanding of the ways in which intellectual life may be marginalized within communities racialized as Black. Academic subjectivity for Black intellectuals within educational settings is linked to white, bourgeois life in the United States. As Cornell West indicates, "the choice of becoming a Black intellectual is an act of self-imposed marginality; it assures a peripheral status in and to the Black community" (West 1991, 146). Black people, as either students or teachers, are suspect within their own communities as well as marginalized in academic communities. In Black communities, the perception is of a sellout for personal social mobility, while in academic communities Black bodies are pathologized. This catches Black intellectuals in the aporia between competing discourses--a space in which it is difficult to speak without continually insisting on a subject position located as both Black and intellectual. The Black intellectual, according to Cornell West, is a "kind of bastard in the West" (West 1991, 146) in which subjectivity consists "neither in a deferential disposition toward the Western parent nor a nostalgic search for the African one. Rather it resides in a critical negation, wise preservation, and insurgent transformation of this hybrid lineage which protects the earth and projects a better world" (West 1991, 146). For bell hooks the dilemma of Black subjectivity within educational settings is further complicated by processes of genderization. For Black women to become intellectuals is to become de-colonized of white supremacy, capitalism, and patriarchy (hooks 1991, 160).

Race-ing the Voicing of Experience

Just as queering pedagogy problematizes ways in which heteronormativity informs homosexual experience, race-ing pedagogy interrogates white-normativity as the context in which to understand experiences of those who are not white. Experience is problematized by looking at the ways that processes which privilege 'whiteness' colonize others and how 'whiteness' assumes universal significance. To be racialized as white consists, in part, of constructing all Others as racialized and racially subordinate. Experiences of oppression by these 'others' are linked to "whiteness as a structural power relation that confers cultural and economic privileges" (Roman 1993, 72). Experiences of racialization, as experienced by non-whites, are materialized effects of white imperialism. As bell hooks indicates, Black experiences of white people are experiences of white fears and domination (hooks, 1992).

White racism "is a significant element in the experience of black children" in schools (Hatcher & Troyna, 1993, 123). Experiences of 'ethnic'[17] children include the epistemic violence of white children's rejection of them *and* that of white researchers who are unable to see the significance of this: for example, the reporting "that children's rejection of other ethnic groups was chiefly verbal" and, therefore, ostensibly not so bad (as reported in Hatcher & Troyna 1993, 109).

Race-ing experience is to continuously play with categories in pedagogies of representation and the representation of pedagogy.[18] It is to denaturalize, denativitize, dedoxify racialized experience as well as see experience as not wholly consitituted by white discourse; to see that white culture no longer operates as the hidden norm against which all other racialized groups are measured (Roman 1993, 71).

Race-ing pedagogy critiques the history of white supremacy around the world, which materializes on bodies and in texts. While "'experience' is an enabling focus in the classroom" (Mohanty 1994, 154), without an understanding of how experience is embodiment of the material effects of white imperialist discourse, voicing experience is just a bland telling of stories. While multicultural telling of experiences is fixed in a frame of western notions of a culture (Chow 1993) in which those racialized as white pronounce judgement on the literature, text and culture of contemporary Others, telling experiences which are not part of the frame of white constructions of the other, can be disruptive of the white/nonwhite binary. Rey Chow identifies the discomfort to colonizers when the experiences voiced by those who are racialized, reified, or fixed as Other "no longer stay...in their frames" (Chow 1993, 28). Using Edward Said's insight (1979) that the frame is a white construction, Chow argues that the Native who exists within this space is really "the displaced object...both a sign of violence and of 'progress'" (Chow 1993, 45). The 'native' represents the epistemic violence of western discourse, including educational discourse, towards those racialized Other-than white. Yet, the 'native' is not consumed by her or his experiences as racialized Other. Those who are consumed by the idea of 'the native' are white people. The native returns, not within white racialized discourse, but on her own terms "and she stares indifferently, mocking our imprisonment within imagistic resemblance and our self-deception as the non-duped" (Chow 1993, 54).

---

[17] Ethnic is another term signifying either race or ethnicity. Some anti-racism cultural workers prefer ethnicity to race as a category (Toh 1992), while others, for example Hatcher and Troyna (1993), use these terms interchangeably.

[18] This expression comes from "Living dangerously: Identity politics and the new cultural racism", in *Between Borders* (Giroux 1994).

Situated Resistances

Resistance in situated pedagogies is embodied in the pedagogues. The force of arguments made by Rey Chow, Gayatri Spivak, bell hooks, Cornell West, and Chandra Mohanty is a result of their raced bodies within academic institutions. Anne-Louise Brookes and Patti Lather embody differentiation as female; Britzman and Watney as 'queer'. Content of situtated pedagogies is likely to reflect Giroux's concern for the inclusion of popular culture but this will be resistant to dominant popular culture--for example, Black rap music or 'queer' imagery, or alternate 'feminist' newspapers.

Whereas Freire's model of resistance is premised on insider-outsider economic binaries in which critical pedagogy encourages resistance to outside structures, resistance for situated pedagogies is to educational processes that contribute to processes such as racialization, genderization, and sexualization; that is resistance to normalizing identity-subject formations. Yet, unlike Freire's model, most situated pedagogies, leave the student-teacher dyad intact.

Several critical pedagogues have written about student resistance, but resistance *to* critical pedagogy or *to* the critical pedagogue is often taken up in terms of resistance conceptualized on a 1960's model of student rebellion. By strategizing ways in which to contend with resisting students, creative pedagogues cast students as deficient and/or delinquent.

Patti Lather encourages reflexivity in critical pedagogy, a strategy she sees as both resistant and post-positivist. She writes that "student resistance to our classroom practices [must not be dismissed] as false consciousness"; she says that she wants to "explore what these resistances have to teach us about our own impositional tendencies" (Lather 1991, 76). Likewise feminist Jennifer Gore, comments on being aware of resistance to her own regimes of truth (Gore 1993). Elizabeth Ellsworth explores resistance to modernist assumptions about possibilities for rational discussion about highly charged and emotional sharing of lived experience (Ellsworth 1993). Emotion in the classroom is recognized as an important strategy of resistance by bell hooks (hooks 1994) as it is by Brookes, Ellsworth, and in an earlier work by Allison

Jagger (1989). Resistance to expected means of communicating in the academy is promoted by Brookes in the form of stories, letters, and journals.

It is my contention that resistance in the classroom cannot be fully understood without a deconstruction of the categories 'teacher' and 'student'. While not doing this work herself, Mimi Orner signals the importance of this "deconstructive revolt".

> [D]emands for student voice in the educational writings of critical and Anglo-American feminist theorists presuppose subject positions for *teachers* and *students* which are highly problematic when seen through the lenses of feminist poststructuralist theories. (Orner 1993, 75, emphasis added)

None of the critical pedagogues of whom I am aware have considered that resistance can occur by teachers in classrooms. Resistance is something students do, not teachers. Yet, teachers do resist the resistance of students; some resist the embodied situatedness of some students; some resist seeing that they are implicated in classroom politics; some resist seeing that students may already be politicized.

Summary

In this chapter I have engaged selected authors of creative pedagogy to explore and critique what they have had to say about embodied voices in classrooms, voicing experiences of subjectivity into classrooms, and resistance in classrooms. In summary I suggest that an unproblematized invitation to students or teachers to voice their experiences of subjectivity formation into a classroom assumes a sameness in implications of telling, thus not only levelling the categories 'student' and 'teacher', but perpetuating the notion that experiences of those in nondominant groups, whether students or teachers, can be absorbed in their entirety through their telling. I continue to pursue issues of 'voice' and 'voicing' experience in Chapters Two and Three.

In my exploration of these texts, I have argued that while creative pedagogues are, for the most part, concerned about subjectivity formation, maintenance of the teacher-student binary precludes a wider exploration of subjectivity formation. To assume that teachers are the same in their application of critical pedagogies is to fail to see the situatedness of teachers as pedagogues and the ways in which teachers as well as students experience critical pedagogy differently depending on their embodied situated location. Thus Ellsworth's (1992) embodiment as both white and female has much to do with her discomfort within an anti-racist seminar--not reflexively noticing her own differences is an indication she did not consider this a possibility.

Before looking more closely at voicing experiences of subjectivity into classrooms and resistance in classrooms, I turn in the next chapter to a deconstruction of 'voice' in order to expose that voices are embodied. Understanding that teachers and students come to classrooms embodied and that only some embodiment "comes to matter" (Butler 1993) is important for making sense of voice as a metaphor for empowerment in creative pedagogies, as well as voicing experiences of subjectivity, and understanding resistance in classrooms. When voice, subjectivity and resistance are recognized to be embodied or "materialized" (Butler 1993), it is possible to begin to reconceptualize the student-teacher dyad.

Chapter Two

EMBODIED VOICES

In Chapter One, I emphasized processes of differentiation by which people become racialized, genderized, and sexualized. Another way of conceptualizing these processes more generally is to understand bodies as "essentialized" or, in the words of Judith Butler, "materialized", by certain cultural processes. Butler writes:

> What I would propose...is a return to the notion of matter, not as a site or surface but as *a process of materialization that stabilizes over time to* produce the effect of boundary, fixity, and surface we call matter. (Butler 1993, 10, emphasis in original)

While Butler's discussion of the materializaton of bodies is taken up in the context of sexed and heterosexualized bodies, it can be extended to ways in which bodies materialize as racialized as well. Playing with the double meaning of "materialize" and "matter", Butler argues that, although bodies are material, it is important to notice which bodies "come to matter" (Butler 1993, 23) in a culture.

> To "concede" the undeniability of "sex" ["race"] or its materiality, is always to concede some version of "sex" ["race"], some formation of "materiality"....What will and will not be included within the boundaries of "sex" "[race"] will be set by a more or less tacit operation of exclusion. (Butler 1993, 10, 11)

For example, the materialization of two "sexes" "is partially responsible for the kind of form that contours the bodily matter of sex" (Butler 1993, 17) and what is conceived of as "stable bodily contours" relies on a conception of corporeality that invests surfaces and orifices with "erotic signification or close[s] down others" and effectively determine[s] what it is to be a body at all" (Butler 1990, 132, 133).

It is not, then, sufficient to state the obvious: that voices are always embodied.

In the call for 'voice' in the classroom, it is necessary to notice that some embodied voices have "materialized" in ways sanctioned by a culture, and even when they have not, they often will be engaged as materialized (essentialized) as sexed or racialized. Depending on whether one's materialization is privileged, some embodied voices will "come to matter" more than others (Butler 1993, 23) in the classroom. Ignoring ways in which 'voice' is materialized in classrooms obscures that there are limits to the metaphor of 'voice' as empowerment and, as well, constructs a call for 'voice as empowerment' as a neutral or innocent call. In order to re-emphasize my argument from Chapter One that claims by creative pedagogues about 'coming to voice' are not innocent of their own desires and embodiment, I say something more about 'noninnocence', and 'noninnocence' of formal education followed by a deconstructive reading of 'voice'. I do this in order to expose the limits of 'voice' as a metaphor for empowerment in the context of embodied participants in classrooms, and to show how 'voice' as a goal for creative pedagogues maintains a strict pedagogue-student binary, contributing to what I have referred to as 'teacherization' and 'studentization'.

Noninnocent Knowledge

The "end of innocence" has been lamented by many writers in quite different contexts. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, for example, longed for an 'innocent' state in nature--his treatise for education is premised on developing (male) citizens from this 'natural state'. Claude Levi-Strauss wished for an 'innocence' he thought to be inherent in the primordial life of the Nambikwara peoples prior to their 'contamination' by civilization. Both Rousseau and Levi-Strauss wanted to 'return' to a time and place based on assumptions within their written work. Both operated within disciplines in which their 'knowledge' allowed authoritative claims about 'innocence', 'savages', 'primordial people', and proximity of speech acts to 'true selves'. Yet, their knowledge claims were not innocent of their own needs, wants, and desires. 'Innocent Others' for Rousseau and Levi-Strauss turned out to be 'inferior' beings--'noble savages' 'primordial perfection', and essentialized women.

As Jane Flax indicates, claims that knowledge is neutral or 'innocent' are based on assumptions that there are "necessary connections between truth, knowledge, emancipation, and justice and that truth and force or domination are necessarily antinomies" (Flax 1992, 457). Flax contends, for example, that what she calls enlightenment feminism

> confuses two different claims--that certain kinds of knowledge are generated by gender-based power relations and that correcting for these biases will necessarily produce 'better', knowledge that will be purely emancipatory (that is, not generated by and generative of its own relations of noninnocent power). (Flax 1992, 457)

Instead of neutral knowledge or innocent truth, Flax, like Michel Foucault, argues that truth and knowledge are the results of mutually accepted rules of discourse.

> Each discourse has its own distinctive set of rules or procedures that govern the production of what is to count as a meaningful or truthful statement....The rules of a discourse enable us to make certain sorts of statements and to make truth claims, but the same rules force us to remain within the system and to make only those statements that conform to these rules. A discourse as a whole cannot be true or false because truth is always contextual and rule dependent. (Flax 1992, 452)

When certain sets of rules predominate and competing discourses are not recognized as possible, the discourse becomes a "regime of truth". Indicating that a particular set of knowledge claims has become a regime of truth--that it is noninnocent--is another way of indicating that there is a "power-knowledge nexus" in which "power and knowledge directly imply one another...there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (Foucault 1979, 27). Knowledges which do not conform to the rules of a dominant discourse or regime of truth are what Michel Foucault referred to as subjugated knowledges: "a whole set of knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated....illegitimate knowledges... filter[ed], hierarchis[ed]...in the name of some true knowledge" (Foucault 1980b, 82, 83).

Recognizing that any practice or discourse is political and not innocent of its own constitutive desires makes it possible to ask the following about any position, no matter what claims have been made about its 'neutrality' and 'objectivity': "'To what ends?' 'For what purposes?' 'With what consequences?'" (Gore 1993, 136), and "what knowledges have been subjugated in order to make this claim?"

Noninnocence of Formal Education

Formal education is a highly contested zone of political activity in which disciplinary claims and disciplinary practices are transmitted. I understand 'disciplinary' in the Foucaultian sense of "those aspects of power and knowledge which are normally masked" (Marshall 1989, 105).

> [Foucault] uses discipline to identify a body of knowledge with a system of social control. A body of knowledge *is* a system of social control to the extent that discipline (knowledge) makes a discipline (control) possible, and vice versa. (Marshall 1989, 107)

There seem to me to be three distinct approaches to the ways in which power-knowledge is taken up in formal education: i) the indifference of those who claim that for knowledge to be knowledge it must be 'objective' and 'neutral' and that this knowledge is apolitical; ii) the concerted opposition by those who see and object to an emergence of knowledges which have been subjugated--an opposition to knowledges of difference; iii) the political intervention by creative pedagogues to encourage and problematize knowledges of difference. Claims from those in each group are noninnocent claims.

Claims that knowledge, as produced in formal education, is neutral and 'objective', are implicated in a noninnocent politics of in/difference. These claims can be made by those who have not had to explore implications of their own privileged positions as producers of knowledge. As Patricia Williams writes: "To live so completely impervious to one's own impact on others is a fragile privilege, which over time relies not simply on the willingness but on the inability of others....to make their displeasure heard" (Williams 1991, 72). To take up a politics of in/difference is to be immune to and contribute to the subjugation of knowledge claims other than one's own. An unacknowledged, unarticulated expectation is that others will be willing participants in the 'innocent' knowledge of formal education.

Those who actively protest against anything different from the traditional canon and pedagogy acknowledge that there are other knowledge claims possible while objecting to anything different from the 'tried and true' and casting these knowledges as 'unmeritorious' and/or 'politically correct'. These actors work against change in formal education, taking advantage of established resources with the consequence that others who protest do so at great social and material cost to themselves.[1] As Cathy Davidson indicates, "instead of simply (and honestly) proposing a conservative agenda, the...tactic is to claim unbiased objectivity, then to denounce the present-day academy from that ostensibly non-ideological stance, and finally to demand reforms that turn out to be highly ideological and politicized (although never acknowledged as such)" (Davidson 1991, 3). These noninncoent claims betray what Davidson calls "p.h" for political hypocrisy.

While creative pedagogues are actively interested in promoting and problematizing 'difference' and some, for example, Freire and Giroux, think it important that those who have been marginalized 'come to voice' in classrooms, it is my contention that creative pedagogues must also acknowledge the noninnocence of their claims and the ways in which these claims may themselves become regimes of truth (Gore 1993). In order to continue the critique of voice I began in Chapter One, I do a deconstructive reading of 'voice' as a metaphor in order to explore the non-innocence of the signifying chain of knowledge=voice=empowerment= liberation in the context of materialized bodies.

---

[1] The University of Victoria Political Science Department is one such site of this political hypocrisy based on a refusal and denial of the importance of difference. The male professoriate are actively opposing the 'Chilly Climate Committee', composed of female students and one female professor. At the University of British Columbia, hate letters have been directed at specific feminist students and instructors. The costs to the women involved have been both immediate and long term. Even when one is not actively looking to change the status quo, one's essentialized or materialized body can be seen as, for example, feminist as was the case at l' Ecole Polytechnique in Montreal where fourteen women were murdered for 'presuming' to want to become engineers.

A Deconstructive Reading of 'Voice'

One way to excavate the multiple meanings that permeate a call to voice in creative pedagogical classrooms is through deconstruction, a method developed by Jacques Derrida. Drucilla Cornell has renamed deconstruction the "philosophy of the limit" in order to disrupt caricatures of deconstruction as nihilistic--as in the often repeated phrase, "deconstructing to nothing".[2] Cornell asserts that

> refocusing attention on the limits constraining philosophical understanding, rather than on negative preconceptions engendered by the notion of "deconstructing" as that concept has been read and misread over the years, draws attention to....how the very establishment of the system as a system implies a *beyond* to it, precisely by virtue of what it excludes. (Cornell 1993, 1)

Deconstruction, or the philosophy of the limit, undermines a text by inverting and displacing hierarchal relations and revealing the absent or suppressed.

> In a traditional philosophical opposition we have not a peaceful coexistence of facing terms but a violent hierarchy. One of the terms dominates the other...[and] occupies the comanding position. To

---

[2] In response to concerns by some feminists that a deconstruction of 'woman' will take the political clout out of feminism because it will make 'women' disappear, Judith Butler writes: "to deconstruct the subject is not to negate or throw away the concept; on the contrary, deconstruction implies only that we suspend all commitments to that to which the term, 'the subject', refers, and that we consider the linguistic functions it serves in the consolidation of authority. To deconstruct is not to negate or dismiss, but to call into question and, perhaps more importantly, to open up a term, like the subject, to a reusage or redeployment that previously has not been authorized" (Butler 1993, 15).

> deconstruct the opposition is above all, at a particular moment, to reverse the hierarchy. (Derrida 1981, 56-57)

Deconstruction is an opening up of the limits of a text, disclosing its limitless possibilities while exposing the complicity of the author in the text. As Gayatri Spivak writes:

> [W]ithin deconstructive practice, [there is the recognition] of provisional and intractable starting points in any investigative effort;...[a] disclosure of complicities where a will to knowledge would create oppositions; [an] insistence that in disclosing complicities the critic-as-subject is herself complicit with the object of her critique...(Spivak 1988, 180)

Meaning is not always present in a sign-word--it is what the sign is and is not; meaning is present and absent (Culler 1982; Sarup 1989). Meaning is scattered, unstable, flickering, absent or erased behind the meaning that 'is' and present; "the play of differences which are generated by signifiers which are themselves the product of those differences ...difference is itself endlessly deferred (Sarup, 1989, 49). Meanings shift and difference is endlessly deferred in word-signs by way of metaphors. Language is riddled with metaphor which is "ubiquitous and ineradicable" (Sarup, 1989, 53) and language may even be considered a metaphor. Because metaphor is such a central device within language, it is crucial to uncover ways in which metaphor shapes what we think and implications of metaphor for thought and action.

Metaphoric use in language must be read under erasure or through 'close-reading' in order to show that "the 'privileged' term depends for its identity on excluding an/other and [to] demonstrate that primacy really belongs to the subordinate term instead" (Sarup, 1989, 56). Close-reading requires erasure, reversal and finally displacement; positioning the absent term in the place of the term which has come under erasure (Culler, 1982). In this way the logic of an argument can be analyzed for inconsistency, ambiguity, contradiction, and paradox.

It is possible to interrupt a text by directing attention at one point, moment, or sign-word within a text, which under erasure, reveals contradictions in the text. By putting a word or concept 'under erasure', one writes the word, crosses it out, and then writes both word and deletion. The original word is inaccurate or inadequate, even while it is necessary to convey a thought.

It is my contention that it is necessary to expose the limits of the metaphor of 'voice' in order to explore implications to embodied participants of absent or deferred meanings. In what follows, I do a deconstructive reading of the metaphor of 'voice' in creative pedagogies in order to expose the "beyond" to a call for voice which, in turn, exposes the complicity or noninnocence of those who would espouse a particular understanding of voice.

Voice Implies Speaking

I speak, therefore I am...a good student.[3]

Speaking has a long history of importance in eurowestern writing. Rousseau and Levi-Strauss thought speech-acts to be closer to 'true self' than written acts because speech, they assumed, is not mediated while writing 'denaturalizes' language (Sarup 1989). The assumption that speech is present to consciousness or the inner self , which Derrida called phonocentrism, is a manifestation of the preoccupation of modern philosophy "with the unity of consciousness and its immediate presence to itself" (Young 1990, 303) as well as a preoccupation with "an immediately available area of certainty" (Sarup 1989, 37). For Derrida, neither speech nor writing are closer to consciousness or inner self--neither has a direct connection.

---

[3] The epigrams at the beginning of each of these sections is another one of my voices.

Implicated in a belief in the primacy of speech-acts is the view that humans are able to creatively and spontaneously express their own meanings; that language is transparent in this expression and that one can voice one's 'true inner self'. An assumption that speech is unmediated and gives ready access to 'true self' is often the impetus for requirements that students voice their experiences into classrooms and, consequently, possibilities for lies, secrets, and motivated silence (Rich 1979) in classrooms by those whose embodied voices have not "come to matter" is unrecognized.

Voice Implies Its Opposite--Silence or Absence of Voice, No Voice, Not-Speaking

There is no quote to convey silence.

In the signifying chain in which voice is implicated, silence is prior to voice. Those who come to voice are able to do so within creative educational settings under the auspices of the creative pedagogue. But does silence always mean that one does not have voice?

Foucault writes the following about silence in *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*:

> Silence itself--the things one declines to say, or is forbidden to name, the discretion that is required between different speakers--is less the absolute limit of discourse, the other side from which it is separated by a strict boundary, than an element that functions alongside the things said, with them and in relation to them within over-all strategies. There is no binary division to be made between what one says and what one does not say; we must try to determine the different ways of not saying such things, how those who can and those who cannot speak of them are distributed, which type of discourse is authorized, or which form of discretion is required in either case. There is not one but many silences, and they are an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses. (Foucault 1980a, 27)

According to Foucault, silence is not the opposite of voice; silence operates in a multiplicity of ways as strategies. Even within those formal educational settings in which creative pedagogies are practiced, silence may mean, among other possibilities, boredom, resistance, thoughtfulness, safety in the face of oppressive discourse, or that there is nothing to say at that particular moment. For example, women's silences in mainstream classrooms are framed by Magda Lewis as resistance strategies that disrupt the hierarchy of phallocentric discursive practices (Lewis 1993). In the context of classrooms in which (some) men's voices are voices of authority and materialization as female signifies less credibility, refusal to speak is a refusal to be co-opted into an unfamiliar and often hostile discourse.

Voice-Speaking Implies Listening-Hearing

Friends, colleagues, classmates, lend me your ears.

Gayatri Spivak writes that, "the question "Who should speak?" is less crucial than "Who will listen?" (Spivak 1990, 59). If creative pedagogies are to "bring to voice" those who are marginalized, there must be listeners. If everyone is voicing, who is listening? Without someone to listen and hear, what is voice? As Magda Lewis writes: "We need to learn new skills: to see what is hidden, to hear the voices that have been silenced against their will..." (Lewis 1993, 194). Yet, as becomes clear in the considerations which follow, a perfunctory giving over of speaking space to those who have not "mattered" is hardly sufficient.

Voice Implies an Understanding Listener

May Yee writes: "Coming here to this strange land where voices cut because of ears that do not listen nor understand....Their voices, loud and complacent like conquerers sure of place, drown out our hesitant and questioning ones" (Yee 1993, 5). Implicated in listening and hearing, is a listener who is silent, one who is attempting to understand. But is a listener who is silent, an understanding listener? In a world that is premised on oppressive hierarchies that are reproduced within formal educational settings, is it enough that a voice be heard, listened to? Does hearing a voice mean that what is being said is understood? Should 'understanding' be a goal of creative pedagogy or does an attempt to achieve understanding assume that all *can* join the dialogue?

Often what is 'understood' or reinvoked are the firmly established assumptions about what another's materialization means.

> [W]hen the card carrying listeners, the hegemonic people, the dominant people talk about listening to someone "speaking as"...When they want to hear an Indian speaking as an Indian, a Third World woman speaking as a Third World

> woman, they cover over the fact of the ignorance that they are allowed to possess...(Spivak 1990, 60)

There is no impetus for those whose bodies are materialized as privileged to attempt to understand those who have not "come to matter".

> [T]here is nothing that necessitates that you understand our world: understand that is not as an observer understands things, but as a participant, as someone who has a stake in them understands them....[Y]ou need to learn to beome unintrusive, unimportant, patient to the point of tears, while at the same time open to learning any possible lessons. You will have to come to terms with the sense of alienation, of not belonging, of having your world thoroughly disrupted, having it criticized and scrutinized from the point of view of those who have been harmed by it, having important concepts central to it dismissed, being viewed with mistrust, being seen as of no consequence except as an object of mistrust. (Lugones in Lugones and Spelman 1986, 23, 29)

As Maria Lugones goes on to ask, "why would any[one]...engage in this task"? (Lugones in Lugones and Spelman 1986, 29). What is the impetus for someone materialized male, or white, or heterosexual to listen and attempt to understand when someone who has not "come to matter" 'comes to voice' in a classroom? What is the impetus for someone materialized as 'other' to speak into this context?

"Coming to Voice" Implies Hierarchy

Also under erasure in the metaphor of 'voice' is a way of thinking about hierarchies and materialized/essentialized bodies. As constructed within creative pedagogies, 'voice' is a goal of students. 'Voice' is something that students lack, whether these are pluralizing voices (Ellsworth, 1992); speaking or deconstructive voices (Lather, 1991); outrageous voices (Abwunza, 1993); academic or one's own voice (Fine, 1987); voice (Fulton 1990, Giroux 1992b); without voice (Lewis, 1993); or critical voice (Britzman 1993).

Students are thought to *lack* voice. To posit a lack in someone else is, what Rey Chows calls, "oedipal thinking". (Chow 1993, 31). Lacking is often linked to a hierarchy in which the lacking person is constructed as simultaneously inferior and responsible for the lack which, in turn, is 'cause' for oppressive behaviours and actions on the part of those around that person. Positing a lack in another places the problem or blame for oppression on the marginalized and offers solutions to the marginalized that are to be accepted in order to improve oppressed circumstances. Students work towards achieving voice and, once voice is achieved, the student has become something more than they once were. A gain has been made. Voice, within this model, is a commodity that students may gain from creative pedagogues. Significantly, what is not 'heard' within this deficit, commodity model of voice is a single student voice. The silence is staggering by its absence.

Rey Chow (1993) and Gayatri Spivak (1988) write about ways in which some bodies are colonized as they are materialized. As Chow writes, "Maoist descriptions" of traditional and historical Chinese culture freeze real, living, breathing Chinese women into a discourse that steals voice away from them. It is my contention that theories of student voice freeze real, living, breathing students into a discourse that steals voice away from students, even as it purports to empower students to achieve 'voice'.

This portrayal of students who 'lack' is not innocent. The premise of the lacking student who only needs to be helped to speak ignores that "'speaking' itself belongs to an already well-defined structure and history of domination....[and that] the type of identification offered by... silent space is what may be called symbolic identification" (Chow, 1993, 36), a structure on which formal education is premised. Do students lack voice or is student voice lacking only when students are materialized as homogeneous, the binary opposite of speaking, knowledgable teachers?

When Gayatri Spivak asks whether the subaltern can speak, her concern is with Bengali women and the outlawing of 'sati'[4] by the British at the same time as 'nativists' enshrined sati within the unwritten cultural code of 'native' pratice. Both the British and the nativist discourse around sati, are, for Spivak, patriarchal. Spivak considers the question, "can the subaltern speak?", to be rhetorical, since a subaltern woman cannot speak into discourses that have already denied her voice in the lived-cultural conditions of her own embodied self. The idea of the 'subaltern' is trapped within a third space but the embodied subaltern speaks into a space which exceeds the discourses of nativist and British unwritten and written laws. This speaking in multiple sites is not only outside the limits of understanding for those in the dominant discourses, but speaking by the subaltern is often beyond and does not countenance those dominant discourses which attempt to contain this speaking.

The idea of 'student', likewise, is trapped between dominant discourses about students, yet embodied students exceed these discourses. How can students speak into the pedagogical discourse that has already denied them voice? How can pedagogy become a dialogue between the student and teacher when students have been constructed as lacking voice? How can pedagogical discourse avoid pedogogue-centrism?

---

[4] Sati is a highly complicated cultural practice that has not been understood within eurowestern notions as the practice of widows throwing themselves onto the funeral pyre of their husbands. As with so much else outside of a particular cultural experience, perhaps sati cannot be understood in its' entirety, which is part of Spivak's point.

Implications of a Deconstruction of 'Voice'

Voice is part of a signifying chain: voice-speaking-listening-hearing-understanding which depends on a number of assumptions-- that students require teachers to enable them to 'come to voice'; that teachers require students in order for an empowerment of voices to occur in classrooms; that voice requires listeners; that listeners require silence; that speakers require understanding; that (to come full circle) understanding can be achieved by 'coming to voice'.

According to Derrida, western philosophy

> has been in a broader sense 'logocentric', committed to a belief in some ultimate 'word', presence, essence, truth or reality which will act as the foundation of all our thoughts, language and experience. It has yearned for the sign which will give meaning to all others-the 'transcendental signifier'--and for the anchoring, unquestionable meaning to which all our signs can be seen to point. Examples of such signs include: God, the idea, the Self...Derrida argues that logocentrism relates to centrism itself--the human desire to posit a 'central' presence at beginning and end. He states that it is this longing for a centre, an authorizing pressure, that spawns hierarchized oppositions. The superior term in these oppositions belongs to presence and the logos, the inferior serves to define its status and mark a fall. (Sarup 1989, 40-1)

What I call 'pedagogue-centrism' arises from the logocentrism of language that encourages us to think in binaries, exclusions and hierarchies. Who is the self, the speaking "I" about the concept voice? Who is implicated by absence and a doubling of absence within the discourse about voice in creative pedagogy? Implicated in each voice under erasure is the logocentric subject--the author writing about the concept voice. Student voices are significantly absent from the text of critical pedagogies. The "I" of voice then, is the pedagogue: "I"/pedagogues write about your-student voice; "I"/pedagogues create the conditions for your-student voices; "I"/pedagogues analyze your student-experiences (with you) as part of a broader politics of your-student voice (cf. Giroux 1992a, 169); "I"/pedagogues listen critically to and understand your-student voice (see Giroux 1992a, 170); "I"/pedagogues want you-student to speak; "I"/pedagogues think you are resisting what I am teaching (cf. Lather 1991, 123); "I"/pedagogues understand the difficulties I experience in my attempts to use critical and feminist pedagogies with you-students (Gore 1993, 156). At issue in these representations are the questions: who is speaking for whom? What is spoken about? From whose perspective? Of what significance is the logocentrism of pedagogical texts?

When voice is written from the perspective-centre of the pedagogue, it is the pedagogue who *is* (I am), the implicant of the term erased, yet ever present within the concept of voice in its myriad of flickering, shifting meanings. Knowledge=voice= power=liberation are centred around the presence of the pedagogue and the absence of the student, an absence mirrored in the absence of student voice about student voice.

As long as the binary implicit in pedagogue/student remains in place, the logic of 'pedagogue-centric' pedagogy stays in place. Students are relegated to the margin of a discourse that has everything to do with a practice about and for students. "Oedipal thinking", positing a lack in students, draws a rigid boundary between pedagogue/student and does not allow for the possibility of differences within each category. The boundary between pedagogue and student obscures various ways in which voices "come to matter" in classrooms and permits a false and innocent focus on what are complex interrelationships between students and pedagogues as well as among students.

The passivity of student voice constructed from the logocentric subject position of creative pedagogues erases the fact that the dyad 'pedagogue-student' is not fixed and rarely occurs as fixed within formal education. Students are neither passive nor innocent players in pedagogical practice. Creative pedagogical approaches are affected by interactions among all the embodied subjects who come to classrooms. And since embodied subjects are unevenly positioned and socially powered, the setting of creative pedagogy is a minefield of action and resistance.

There are not just two voices--'the' pedagogue and 'the' student--there is a cacophony of student and teacher embodied voices. And yet creative pedagogies rarely acknowledge ways in which varied embodied voices engaged in pedagogical settings affect when and how voice, hearing, and understanding may happen. The logocentrism of pedagogical texts places the responsibility for voice squarely on the shoulders of the pedagogue, indeed assumes this position, and yet the responsibility and possibility of voice/s in classrooms is a dynamic affected by many materialized bodies. 'Coming to voice' in a classroom is not only or always a challenge for students. Those teachers whose own embodiment has not "come to matter" will have great difficulty 'coming to voice' in hostile classrooms while some students, whose materialization as, say, white and male, may have had numerous occasions to 'come to voice' outside the classroom and bring a sense of confidence that their voices "matter" to classroom settings.

Every pedagogue was a student at some time, yet authors of creative pedagogies seem to be consumed by the 'teacher-student' dyad, unable to disrupt it. Teachers, like students, however, are materialized in many different ways and, like students, their embodied voices "come to matter" in classrooms depending upon this materialization. Creative pedagogues must decenter 'voice' away from the pedagogue and realize that teachers are only one actor within a classroom, albeit a voice that materializes within and through a compromised, institutional power.

Summary

In this chapter I have argued that theory-practice in creative pedagogies revolves around a signifying chain of knowledge=voice=power=liberation that focuses on students while claiming to decenter classroom power away from the pedagogue. Yet, these texts are devoid of student voices on the subject of voice. By moving away from pedagogue-centric theory-practice and noticing embodied voices, the "limit" of 'voice' as a metaphor for empowerment becomes more clear. Understanding complexities of 'voice' severely limits what can be accomplished in pedagogical spaces: pedagogical 'intentions' that participants 'come to voice' may be enhanced, disrupted, interrupted, or blown apart.

By deconstructing and displacing both the subject and object in the 'voice' of creative pedagogy, a false binary between student and teacher is exposed. This false binary prevents an opening up of the categories 'student' and 'teacher' and obscures ways in which embodied 'voices' defy or complicate the student-teacher binary. In the next chapter, I explore another implication of embodied voices--that 'voice' signifies a claim to an understanding of one's subjectivity.

Chapter Three

VOICING EXPERIENCES OF SUBJECTIVITY

> [Experience is] a process by which, for all social beings, subjectivity is constructed. Through that process one places oneself or is placed in social reality, and so perceives and comprehends as subjective (referring to, even originating in, oneself) those relations--material, economic and interpersonal--which are in fact social and, in larger perspective, historical....The process is continuous, its achievement unending or daily renewed. For each person, therefore, subjectivity is an ongoing construction, not a fixed point of departure or arrival from which one then interacts with the world. On the contrary, it is the effect of that interaction--which I call experience; and thus it is produced not by external ideas, values, or material causes, but by one's personal subjective, engagement in the practices, discourses, and institutions that lend significance...to the events of the world.
> (de Lauretis 1984, 159)

A close-reading of 'voice' in Chapter Two revealed that implicated in 'voice' are speaking, silence, listening, understanding, and authorities who facilitate 'voice' and, as well, that utilizing a metaphor of 'voice' to signify empowerment cannot be understood apart from ways in which some embodiments of voice and not others "come to matter" in classrooms. To indicate that voices are embodied is another way of signifying that speaking voices emanate from people--from selves, from embodied subjectivities. 'Voice', then, also signifies a claim to an understanding of one's subjectivity and since, as de Lauretis notes, subjectivity is constructed through experiences, to voice subjectivity is to voice experiences of subjectivity formation. In this chapter, I explore implications of 'voice' as subjectivity by taking up examples from my own subjectivity formation while considering complexities of what is at stake in a prescription to voice experiences of subjectivity formation into classrooms as an emancipatory strategy.

Experiences of Subjectivity

> *I gaze at the photograph-representation of a child. I can tell the child is a girl because of the signifiers in this representation that mean female: she is wearing a skirt, her hair is captured at the temple in a barrett, her hair is long, fluffy, curly. Other signifiers are available: she holds a toy telephone receiver in her hands which are arranged in her lap. She is caucasian, with very blonde hair, eyes assumed to be blue although the representation does not reveal this colour exactly. From this photograph, I know much about this little girl: about four years of age, a 'she' who is white, middle class*[1]*: I am able to read her sex, race, and class. Those who cannot afford to eat cannot afford studio photographs like this one: the studio name is engraved in the corner. Photos like this were rarely taken of her brothers after the age of two. Female appearance was very important for this little girl--the ideal of family insisted on recording and reifying it. To be female is to be photographed, to be gazed at; to be ever conscious of looking at herself and knowing she is being looked at: pretty, white, female, young, privileged.*[2]

---

[1] Although in my foreword, I indicated that my family of origin was working class, I think it is fair to say that as working class people, we were often able to take part in middle class culture as economic circumstances shifted.

[2] This is what I see when I look at a life sized photograph of 'myself' which was enlarged and given to me for my fortieth birthday.

According to Anthony Kerby, there are three interrelated misconceptions that exist in ideas about human subjectivity: i) The belief that there is a doer before the deed-- language posits an 'I' that thinks and an 'I' that acts as well as an 'I' which is before them or the cause of them; ii) The belief in intentions or thoughts that exist prior to linguistic expressions; that we give voice to thoughts that exist prior to speech-acts; iii) The belief that language has a neutrality or transparency with respect to what is expressed; that language is connected to 'reality' (Kerby 1991, 65). As Kerby indicates, however, the world, self, and language are inseparable and develop together.

> One might begin, as a child does, relating to "words", or rather to sounds, as mere signals, precursors of sensory events. But later in the child's life the sensory recedes as the signs and more abstract references multiply. One learns, for example, to signify the absent conceptually (a process already prefigured by passive recollection), not only to see but to refer by name to aspects of what is or has been seen. We are thus gradually educated into a broad realm of symbols and signification. But we are also, in this way, educated into the sociocultural sphere. (Kerby 1991, 66)

Not only is 'reality' grasped through language, this grasp is done, in large measure, unconsciously. Moreover, while language allows for multiple, almost unlimited, reflexivity and expression, it is not only used to express and reflect: it is part of the very definition of being human (Kerby 1991, 67).

Understanding of self is reproduced in and through the personal pronouns 'I' and 'you'. Self-consciousness cannot be separated from one's history of taking on and voicing 'I'.

> *The subject 'I' of my presentation of a representation of myself is myself today, deconstructing myself at age four. 'I' read the signifiers of the photograph and reflect on how these signifiers, as visible (?), tangible (?) evidence of the language-discourse, unconsciously shaped the four year old child, and have shaped the subject 'I' that is me today. There were doers before the deed that has become me--but these were no prediscursive renditions of myself. The doers were others already invested in language whose discourses I came to share (?). The language that I use to describe the child in the picture is not transparently coded; it is not-neutral. 'Sex' is soaked in value as are class and the colour of my skin . The 'I' that came into being is an 'I' whose body was coded and essentialized through the ways in which white, female, and middle-class were valued: these codes existed before 'I' did. These codes constitute me, when 'I' speak. I speak from within this coded body: I am an embodied subject.*
>
> *Less implicitly present in the photograph is the coding of heterosexuality ever present in heterosexual, nuclear families modelled on eurowestern claims of tradition and naturalness: the family within which this 'girl' was constituted.*

The 'core' of the self resides in a pre-linguistic or pre-narrative self that is caught in unconscious desires and discourses which reflect these desires. My self is caught in and through the language and action of those and that which is around me: white, middle-class, heterosexual, nuclear 'family'. Language provides the signs which shape the unconscious, preconscious, and conscious of individual selves, *but* this is a shaping that is always in relationship to other individuals who, in turn, are shaped and shaping in and through language.

> *Thinking about an 'I' that is implicated in practices/uses of 'them'-'you' is helpful towards considering the ways in which different discursive selves operate to include and exclude other discursive selves-embodied selves, as this happens in and through language and interactions. How do the ways that 'I' think of Others, influence the ways in which I listen and understand them...or not listen and refuse understanding? How does this operate when Others listen and understand or refuse understanding and not listen to me? The idea of embodied selves-subjects allows me to see how both those who are and those who are not embodied as 'normal' become trapped within discourse...trapped in language and action by Others. What does it mean to be embodied as white, female and middle-class? What doesn't this mean? How does the small body of a child reflect this embodiment? How does the 'I' within this body reflect back and upon and through the language that constructs her body as white, female and middle-class?*

'I' and 'you' are effects of language--effects of ways in which language brings into play actions and interactions, including speech-acts, between self and selves, selves and selves: embodied, essentialized, semiotic[3] selves. Notions related to an autonomous subject, then, are "measures of the prevailing sociolinguistic system and its customs", not "elements of a pregiven 'human essence'" (Kerby 1991, 113).

A further structuring of language occurs through discourse--those "institutionalized sets of mutually accepted norms and practices of communication through which social intelligibility is achieved" (Murphy 1993, 31). We are not only positioned and positioning in and through language, language comes to us in the form of conflicting discourses which "constitute us as conscious thinking subjects and enable us to give meaning to the world and to act to transform it" (Weedon 1987, 32). Far from being founded on an essence that predates language or discourse, subjectivity is ambiguous, precarious, contradictory and in process. Selves are "constantly being reconstituted in discourse each time we think or speak" (Weedon 1987, 33).

Subjectivity is "in process", yet embodied--the construction[4] or materialization of embodiment are also effects of language and discourse. Judith Butler's notion of the materialization of bodies discussed in Chapter Two, permits an understanding that there is no prediscursive body--no prediscursive embodied subjectivity. Butler puts this point in the following way about the impossibility of a prediscursive embodied female subjectivity.

---

[3] Semiotics designates processes "by which a culture produces signs and/or attributes meanings to signs" (de Lauretis 1984, 167). De Lauretis writes that semiotics maps "how the physical properties of bodies are socially assumed as signs, as vehicles for social meaning, and how these signs are culturally generated by codes and subject to historical modes of sign production" (de Lauretis 1984, 24).

[4] According to Judith Butler in order to claim that a body is material yet constructed requires a rethinking of what "construction" means. She writes: "And if certain constructions appear constitutive, that is, have this character of being that "without which" we could not think at all, we might suggest that bodies only appear, only endure, only live within the productive constraints of certain highly gendered regulatory schemas" (Butler

> [Is] there a political shape to "women"...that precedes and prefigures the political elaboration of their interests and epistemic point of view? How is that identity shaped, and is it a political shaping that takes the very morphology and boundary of the sexed body as the ground, surface, or site of cultural inscription? What circumscribes that site as "the female body"? Is "the body" or "the sexed body" the firm foundation on which gender and systems of compulsory sexuality operate? Or is "the body" itself shaped by political forces with strategic interests in keeping that body bounded and constituted by the markers of sex? (Butler 1990, 128-129)

As Drucilla Cornell indicates, one aspect of deconstruction that is overlooked is the secondness or the "materiality that persists beyond any attempt to conceptualize it" (Cornell 1992, 1). This is the materiality that underlies each of us at the moment we come into language. That bodies are material does not, however, open a door to positing a prediscursive subjectivity. There are no embodied experiences of subjectivity prior to discourse. There are no experiences to be had of 'womanhood', whiteness, economic status or sexuality which are consequences of an essential embodiment with meaning prior to materialization as female, white, middle class, 'queer'.

1993, xi).

'Voicing' Experiences of Subjectivity

Most emancipatory movements share a recognition of the importance of validating experiences through the voicing of experiences by those who have been subjugated. Voicing experiences of oppression is central, for example to Paulo Freire's liberatory pedagogy, as it has been in many feminist educational settings in which, following the example of "consciousness raising"[5] sessions of early 1970's North American feminism, it has been assumed that naming experiences "central to women's lives, which [were] wordless for many years" (Kramarae and Treichler, 1985) would have a liberatory effect. The importance of women telling experiences is still central to many feminist works. Somer Brodribb (1992) claims, for example, that "the best methodology for evaluating the practice of theory that is put before us as what feminists must attend to if we are really serious about social change is whether it originates from feminist politics and women's experiences" (Brodribb 1992, xxvii). Echoing Brodribb, Diana Fuss writes that "critical pedagogies of liberation... necessarily embrace experience, confession and testimony as relevant ways of knowing" (Fuss 1991, 180).

Constance Penley writes that feminist teaching is like psychoanalysis in that each has a "particularly tenuous and highly fraught relation to pedagogy" (Penley 1989, 67). Both feminist and psychoanalytic pedagogies claim to give voice to knowledge that has been inaccessible to one's consciousness prior to the pedagogical moment in which 'new' knowledge becomes conscious. Both posit an unconsciousness or unlearned condition of the student. The split is between consciousness-unconsciousness or learned-unlearned. For feminism that split is between the personal and political; for psychoanalysis, it is the conscious and unconscious and in each, the pedagogical imperative is to bring that which is split together. Both are premised on nonauthoritative knowledge claims: psychoanalysis looks to dreams, jokes, slips in speech-acts and feminism looks "beyond 'scientific' certitudes about femininity to what can be learned instead from the personal observations and experiences of women" (Penley 1989, 74). For each, the importance of retrieving feelings and experiences is fundamental to a coming to consciousness. For feminist pedagogies, in particular, the comparison of one's own experiences and feelings with other women students, while working through feminist theory, aids the process of coming to consciousness. Both are particularly post-empiricist-positivist, denying the obviousness of knowledged scientific claims. Each, however, draws on a notion of 'common sense' or what seems obvious or 'natural' about women to excavate or make conscious an awareness thought to be fundamental to individual change and, in turn, social change.

---

[5] I do not wish to assume a monolithic understanding of consciousness raising sessions of early 1970's feminism. This practice for many was not simply a telling of experiences. Consciousness raising was and still is a useful strategy.

Feminist pedagogies are intent on uncovering the learned-unlearned and conscious-unconscious aspects of student-selves. The assumption is that by surfacing self through voicing experiences of oppression (consciousness raising), one will come to understand one's oppression, become empowered and achieve liberation. This is another version of the knowledge=voice=power-liberation signifying chain. As with other creative pedagogical projects, in feminist classrooms students are often intent on uncovering aspects of her self/selves.

As the deconstruction of 'voice' in Chapter Two demonstrates, 'coming to voice' is not a guarantee of 'emancipation'. Indeed, in order to take up 'voice' as a means to achieve emancipation, one must assume that self or subjectivity is transparent and present to consciousness; that in the speaking, subjectivity will be listened to and apparent to others; and that silence is an indication of one's complicity or disempowerment. As important, a notion that one can 'come to voice' or achieve 'liberation' through telling of experiences of subjectivity posits experience as "the ontological foundation of... identity and politics", providing both a "starting point and a conclusive kind of explanation, beyond which few questions need to or can be asked" (Scott 1992, 32, 34).

It seems obvious that the representation I gaze at is a girl. But what makes this obvious? Only the signifiers and me, an already knowledged reader of these signs, make this observation-gaze obvious. There is nothing commonsensical about this. "I" have learned to think and see this way.

Problematizing 'Voicing' Experience

> When experience is taken as the origin of knowledge, the vision of the individual subject...becomes the bedrock of evidence upon which explanation is built. Questions about the constructed nature of experience, about how subjects are constituted as different in the first place, about how one's vision is structured...are left aside. The evidence of experience then becomes evidence for the fact of difference, rather than a way of exploring how difference is

> established, how it operates, how and in what ways it constitutes subjects who see and act in the world. (Scott 1992, 25)

What could be more 'true' than a subject's own account of a lived experience? This 'common sense' approach to experience not only assumes that "we can trust an individual's perception of reality and the 'evidence' of her experience" (Chris Weedon 1987, 79), but that "knowledge follows from and leads to identity--in which experience unique to women [whites, heterosexuals] is prior to thought " (Crosby 1992, 133). Experience, on this view, is uncontestable evidence and the foundation on which further analysis is based. Moreover, telling of experience is sometimes thought to provide the impetus for a conversion moment--a moment in which one comes to see what was previously not seen, as it was and is in feminist 'consciousness raising' groups.

> *What can I know about the four year old child who was me...what access do "I" have to the child represented in the picture? What can I know without relying upon signifiers that mark the picture and my gaze at the picture, and what, if anything does this tell me about the child who really was, must have been me? What does it tell me about the me gazing at the picture of this child? And yet it is in and through our growing up years that the self that we are today was partially shaped and shaping, primarily through unconscious means. Our essentialized bodies are, in part, the pernicious effects of this early and inaccessible*

time of our own history. We did not spring fully formed into adulthood and yet what can we safely say about the times prior to adulthood?

To answer these questions, I might undergo a genealogical tracing and then telling of processes and procedures of discourses in which I was embedded in order to notice how these discourses enabled and restricted (constructed) 'choices'. Coming to know myself involves a project of re-covering a new form of myself through recounting the effects of the micropractices and techniques of discourses of which my experiences are effects. Doing this genealogical search while taking seriously the unconscious and the non-transparency of language may lead to a clearer understanding of processes materializing "inner workings" (Scott 1992, 25) of my subjectivity, yet even this understanding will be only partial, fragmentary and ambiguous. We can only 'know' experiences from our younger selves through significations rooted in the artifacts and memories of ourselves and others. As Doris Lessing indicates memory is "a careless and lazy organ" from which "we make up our pasts...How do you know that what you remember is more important than what you don't" (Lessing, reported in *Ms.* 1994, 79). Memory severely limits our understanding of our selves and, hence, places limits on possibilities for genealogical tracing of subjectivity.

Since both the unconscious and gaps in memory make a genealogy of subjectivity always only partial, experiences when narrated by students in classrooms, are already contaminated by an absence, an unknowing buried in the unconscious construction of subjectivity within one's formative years as a child. This unknowing may become a partial knowing which resurfaces as feelings or emotions but not yet or ever articulable.[6] What can be safely theorized or 'known' beyond these feelings and emotions? As semiotic subjects, we mediate memories through the lens of adulthood, language, and discourse; it is not possible to get closer to the experiences of childhood than a flickering of emotions and feelings allow. And yet, it is in and through childhood that the subject I *begins* processes of semiotic and symbolic subjectivity formation. Even while childhood is important to the uncovering of subjectivity formation, "the process [of identity formation and identity interrogation] is continuous, its achievement unending or daily renewed" (de Lauretis 1984, 159).

A genealogical interrogation exposes, in part, how I have been shaped by various processes of differentiation--it may expose what and how I have been differentiated as white, as female, as middle class, but genealogy does not expose the "beyond" which fixes these processes. An uncovering of subjectivity, then, also requires that I deconstruct my experiences of subjectivity in order to explore the "limits" upon which these differentiations depend to do their work. As Derrida writes:

> To 'deconstruct' [subjectivity] is thus to work through the structured genealogy of its concepts in the most scrupulous and immanent fashion, but at the same time to determine, from a certain external perspective that it cannot name or describe, what this history may have concealed or excluded, constituting itself as history through this repression in which it has a stake. (Derrida 1981, 15, 16)

In other words, in order to attempt to understand my subjectivity formations, I must also expose the boundary or border between 'masculinity' and 'femininity', 'white' and 'nonwhite', 'christian' and 'nonchristian', 'heterosexual' and 'homosexual' and the ways in which these borders have been policed in my experiences. Interrogation of experiences of subjectivity will require that I not just trace the intricacies of the "inner workings" of my whiteness, for example, but that I expose how the border maintaining my whiteness has been monitored.

---

[6] Another reason why emotion should not be banished from classrooms.

> *What props operate to fix and maintain my/self as white, as middle class? How did I , when a grade two student , come to police the border between white and black, making it my own exercise of a racist ideology, materializing the effects of that ideology towards an-Other little girl..."I can't play with her", I said, "my mother wouldn't like it." It had somethimg to do with Ham, Shem, and Japeth; with christianity and the imperative that the 'races should not mix'. It had somethimg to do with my parent's references to people of other races. It had something to with blackness marked as those starving, in need of missionary help, or engaged in tribal warfare--others to be feared. It had something to do with the laws of the land and who good immigrants are, who bad immigrants are; who could immigrate to this country called Canada. It had something to do with who was and was not represented in books, in magazines, who my family associated with, the students, the faces of everyone around me--everything to do*

> *with the reactions of those around me to anyone different from white. Those of us marked white and middle-class, who can trace anglo-saxon, euro-western heritage, I-We are marked by discourses that materialize our subjectivities as superior while absenting the material props that maintain positions of superiority. Yet, our subjectivities are implicated in global structures which materialize Other bodies as starving, demonized and in need of salvation, killed and killing in tribol warfare. Our middle classness is propped up by colonialism, post-colonialism, imperialism: global exercise of power over and against those materialized-marked differently than white and middle-class and heterosexual.*

Experiences of the way in which 'the outside' to my experiences of whiteness (and other processes of differentiation) are monitored must be told and interrogated in order to expose the policed boundary between the legitimate and the illegitimate--the border between white and nonwhite (normalized and other).

Problematizing the Problematizing of Experience

As described in Chapter One, some creative pedagogues do recognize the necessity of interrogating experiences rather than taking experiences at 'face value'. Henry Giroux, for example, thinks that critical pedagogy can enable an uncovering of the exploitation and subjugation of marginalized peoples. Yet, Giroux and other pedagogues who think either telling or interrogating experience is important for education, do not adequately pay attention to ways in which both telling and interrogating experiences have differential effects on those in classrooms.

Interrogation of experiences of subjectivity formation is not a neutral process in classrooms. Some experiences can be neither told nor interrogated without great psychological or physical danger to the narrator. The force or weight of some experiences, for example experiences of racialization, are such that denial of the marginalizing effects of these experiences by other participants in a classroom may become just one more tired experience of racialization--of racism. Those who are subjugated are required to tell *and* interrogate their experiences, while those who have been materialized as normal tell their already familiar experiences while not interrogating them. Meanwhile the interrogated tellings of subjugated peoples are subject to voyeurism, denial, and/or appropriation.

Very often experiences of subjugated peoples are met with incredulity by those in dominant cultures. Linda Eyre reports the following response to an article exposing heterosexism:

> In the article Michael Wicks writes about his experiences as a gay student and teacher in a homophobic school environment, and calls for an end to the conspiracy of silence surrounding homosexuality and to the destructive expression of homophobia in schools...Most men and a few women questioned Wicks' statistics on the number of people who define themselves as lesbian or gay. Some men said Wicks exaggerated the extent of homophobia in schools. (Eyre 1993, 277)

Telling and interrogating experiences by subjugated peoples are often used as occasions for those in dominant groups to "feed off the tears of stories" (Razack 1993, 97) or to recoil in horror.

> I knew well the experience of telling 'unacceptable' stories to teachers who are not strong. As you know the reaction is sometimes one of horror: it is rather like homophobia, where people fear for themselves.... In a schooling context, this kind of response is damaging: it reaffirms the bad feelings... (Brookes 1992, 87-88).

Often telling and interrogation of experience by subjugated people is met with a "me too" reaction so that, paradoxically, voicing experiences of difference into a classroom as a means to interrogate subjectivity formation often levels difference. Since everyone will have different experiences of subject formation, it is possible, as Christina Crosby has remarked, to "cheerfully acknowledg[e] that since everyone is different, everyone is the same"[7] (Crosby 1993, 140). Yet, a difference which cannot be levelled is the differential way in which a call for interrogation can be taken up in classrooms (Shogan, 1994). Interrogation of the production of some differences, say homosexuality, is highly dangerous when expected in a public forum like a classroom whose members are very often homophobic. Quite simply, some selves, some bodies are more at risk than others--this is true whether devalued difference is embodied in students or educators. A genealogical tracing and deconstructing of 'difference' does not make either privileges or materialized categories disappear from people's lives. To ignore this is to put some at risk in the attempt to have experiences of difference told and interrogated in classrooms. By not acknowledging the differential ways in which identity interrogation can be pursued, some differences necessarily remain subjugated.

---

[7] The proliferation of a liberal pluralist idea of difference as sameness is another way of insisting that all harms are equal. For example the idea that Nazi soldiers were victims as much as Jewish people during the Holocaust is a popular notion amongst some revisionist historians (Smith 1994). The claim is that the perpetrator of a hate crime is harmed by the action as well as those who have been victimized, missing the obvious, that reduced humanity as a harm is hardly the same as death. Nazi soldiers were perhaps victimized by the state or structural power while Jewish people were victimized by structural power as well as the micro-level exercise of power by individual Nazi soldiers.

As I argued in Chapter one, creative pedagogues who advocate telling experiences (Freire) or telling and interrogating experiences (Giroux) of marginalization assume that it is desirable and possible for marginalized people to attempt to dialogue across differences by sharing experiences. Yet, as became clear in Chapter Two, advocating such a possibility depends upon an assumption about the transparency of experience both to the person who remembers the experience and to the person hearing the experience. As Spivak's discussion about the subaltern demonstrates, it is not possible for someone marginalized to tell or interrogate her experiences in dominant discursive spaces, except in the terms of the dominant discourse.

Even if it was possible to communicate experiences of subjectivity into classrooms for the purposes of interrogating and dialoguing about them, it is, as I discussed above, often not desirable for marginalized people to do so. Because it is so often not desirable for marginalized peoples to speak interrogated experiences into classrooms, when required by a pedagogical approach to speak, marginalized people often distance themselves from their subjectivity, from their experiences, and from others in the classroom. As Gayatri Spivak writes, "The question of 'speaking *as*' involves a distancing from oneself. The moment I have to think of the ways in which I will speak as an Indian, as a feminist, the ways in which I will speak as a woman, what I am doing is trying to generalize myself, make myself a representative, trying to distance myself from some kind of inchoate speaking *as such*" (Spivak, 1990, 60). For lesbians and gay men to speak *as* homosexual is, in Judith Butler's words, to enter another 'closet'.

> What or who is it that is "out", made manifest and fully disclosed, when and if I reveal myself as a lesbian?....[I]t is always finally unclear what is meant by invoking the lesbian-signifier, since its signification is always to some degree out of one's control...If I claim to be a lesbian, I 'come out' only to produce a new and different "closet". The "you" to whom I come out now has access to a different region of opacity. Indeed, the locus of opacity has simply shifted: before you did not know whether I "am", but now you do not know what that means. (Butler 1991, 15, 16)

Even as one problematizes the essentialization of embodied experiences of subjectivity, processes of differentiation operate to reinvoke the categories.

Rather than be consumed by dominant interpretations of one's interrogated experiences, the alternative is to distance oneself from one's subjectivity when in hostile places. "I slip into corners, I remain silent, I strive for anonymity, for invisibility. Look I'll accept the lot, as long as no one notices me!" (Fanon 1990, 112). Or, relatedly, there is an attempt in the telling to distance oneself from an experience, as if it happened to someone else--"I notice when you told me your painful experiences of racism, you disassociated yourself from them" (Sheth in Sheth and Handa 1993, 59) or to tell experiences from a more distant past which may no longer be as harmful. The net effect of this distancing as a response to the undesirability of a prescription to share interrogated experiences, is to produce further kinds of distancing. Outsiders, who are already distanced by virtue of their outsider status, further distance themselves from their experiences and therefore them-selves and are distanced from others in the classroom.

Even distancing does not prevent pain and further damage to those who are outsiders, as one educator discovered after inviting a lesbian colleague into her classroom (Eyre 1993). The experience, which Eyre thought was "powerful" was later described to her by Suzanne de Castell, her colleague, as "personally awful" (Eyre 1993, 274). Elsewhere de Castell describes that being a "resource" person in courses addressing anti-essentialism is like being a "performing parrot"...step right up: a real live Lesbian. She walks and talks and you can ask her anything you want" (de Castell in Eyre 1993, 274).

'Voicing' Experience--Revisited

> My silences had not protected me (Lorde 1984, 41).
>
> The history which bears and determines us has the form of *war* rather than that of a language: relations of power, not relations of meaning. (Foucault 1980b, 114 emphasis added)

Does a critique of both the telling of experiences and interrogating of experiences mean that there is no room for experience, particularly subjugated experiences, in creative pedagogies? How is it possible to avoid exposing marginalized peoples in classrooms without subjugating their experiences once again? "How do we", asks Ann du Cille, "negotiate an intellectually charged space for experience in a way that is not totalizing and essentializing--a space that acknowledges the constructedness of differences within our lived experiences, while at the same time attending to the inclining, rather than the declining, significance of race, class, culture...gender?" (du Cille 1994, 607).

The intrusive 'I' of confessional subjugated voice *can be* transgressive (Bernstein 1992) since this voice is so disruptive of the conventions of authority, especially that involved in the pretense of objectivity. Confessional voices can transgress academic boundaries; they can be multiply situated reverse discourses that challenge the dominant, the norm, the hegemony of dominant discourses. The proliferation of voices of subjugated experiences proliferates possibilities. Yet, as I have indicated, confessional voices can also become appropriated, therefore common and conventional, and thus co-opted as method.

What will be the impetus for those materialized as normal to interrogate their experiences of subjectivity? Is voicing of experiences of subjugation necessary as this impetus, even if damaging to those who do so? Should the classroom be used for interrogation of experiences of normalization, thus once again dominating class time with the voices of the dominant?

> *The child who is represented in a photograph that is an earlier self of the self who is me today reveals a body that has been unambiguously essentialized around signifiers that designate female. What can be known beyond that, are the local historical signifers that structure other categories like race and class.*

> *Experiences that my self has had since that time may be explained in and through these structures. 'I' can do nothing to alter these experiences but awareness of how they came to be me within an essentialized body allows me to reconstitute them in and through future experience, as agentic acts of resistance. It is easy for me to voice the experiences of what I think the child lived through; it is only through an understanding of how these came to be that I can consciously act to change.*

The "war" referred to by Foucault and which I cite at the beginning of this section is a 'call to arms' for subjugated peoples. In the next chapter I turn to resistance and ways in which subjugated experiences of subjectivity can be taken up as resistance.

Chapter Four

RESISTANCE

A Litany for Survival

For those of us who live at the shoreline
standing upon the constant edges of decision
crucial and alone...
For those of us who were imprinted with fear
like a faint line in the center of our foreheads
learning to be afraid with our mother's milk
for by this weapon
this illusion of some safety to be found
the heavy-footed hoped to silence us
For all of us this instant and this triumph
We were never meant to survive...

and when we speak we are afraid
our words will not be heard
nor welcomed
but when we are silent
we are still afraid

So it is better to speak
remembering
we were never meant to survive
(Lorde 1978, 31-32)

One of the most difficult challenges for politicized cultural workers is affecting those changes which require massive alterations to structures, including those which keep policy and curriculum in place in educational sites. The enormity of this task often makes 'revolution' seem the only way for change to occur--a revolution which overthrows power thought to be owned and exercised in a top-down way by those in charge over those who are oppressed by it. An "hypothesis" that change requires a revolutionary overtaking of repressive power often immobilizes action because revolution seems out of the realm of possibility for individuals.

A "repressive hypothesis" of power (Foucault 1980a) negates those myriad small actions which occur over time and produces frustration and despair that the revolution will not come. Social change (and social inertia) are effects of everyday *resistances* in specific sites and in microlevel interactions between and among individuals. Some resistance is resistance to the status quo--a kind of guerilla warfare from the margins-- while other resistance is to anything which would alter the status quo. I appropriate the language of battle and war, taking up the challenge from Foucault in the previous chapter. For those people who, like Rey Chow's 'native', are frozen in the dead space of a frame, the world *is* a battlezone of meanings and epistemic violence, patrolled by border guards and unconscious warriors of the status quo.

Following Judith Butler, I take up the notion of 'performativity' to designate actions which, through their repetition, maintain the status quo and I take up the notion of 'performance' to refer to those actions which attempt to disrupt the status quo. I understand performativity to be a *resistance* that keeps things in place through repetition, and performance to be a *resistance* that disrupts repetitions of oppressive processes of differentiation.

As Judith Butler indicates, "all signification takes place within the orbit of the compulsion to repeat" (Butler 1990, 145). The status quo is "*a regulated process of repetition* that both conceals itself and enforces its rules precisely through the production of substantializing effects" (Butler 1990, 145, emphasis in original). Regulated processes of repetition or, what Butler calls, performativity are what, over time materialialize 'differences' of race, sex, sexuality, and class.

> But how, then, does the notion of gender [race, sexuality, class] performativity relate to this conception of materialization? In the first instance, performativity must be understood not as a singular or deliberate "act", but, rather, as the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects it names...At stake in such a reformulation of the materiality of bodies [is] the following: (1) the recasting of the matter of bodies as the effect of a dynamic of power, such that the matter of bodies will be indissociable from the regulatory norms that govern their materialization and the signification of those material effects; (2) the understanding of performativity not as the act by which a subject brings into being what she/he names, but, rather, as that reiterative power of discourse to produce the phenomena that it regulates and constrains. (Butler, 1993, 3)

In what follows, I repeat examples of repetitive performativities of the materialization of sex, race, sexuality, and class. My repetitious, but not exhaustive, listing of ways in which the status quo is repeated in and around educational contexts is intended, in part, as a disruptive performance in which repetitions of the status quo are exposed as artifice. My litany, or confessional (Foucault 1980a, Bernstein 1992) is a counter-discursive measure to disrupt the business-as-usual performativity of the status quo. Not only is my repetitive performance of the repetitious performativity of the status quo a resistant act by me, I intend these examples to break open the notion of resistance in order to show that both those disrupting and those repeating the status quo are resisting.[1]

In creative pedagogies, resistance is still cast as something that only students do in reaction to either content or particular methods. For example, in a special issue of the *Canadian Journal of Education* as recent as 1992, this observation was made in the overview article:

---

[1] Although both are resistance, Butler argues that only performance is agentic since, she claims, that "'agency'...is to be located within the possibility of a variation on...repetition" (Butler 1990, 145). Consequently, in Butler's terms, while performance as resistance is agentic, performativity as resistance is not.

> Three assumptions should influence such an exploration [of feminist pedagogy]: first, *both teachers and students resist*; second, patterns of resistance are race-, class-, and gender-specific; and third, the *sources of student resistance* may come from multiple political and/or personal locations and is (sic) not necessarily progressive or reactionary. (Briskin and Coulter 1992, 259, emphasis added)

Any headway the first two assumptions may make in including both teachers and students as resistors is undermined by the third assumption which focusses on students and recognizes only student resistance coming from multiple sources. This is like Patti Lather's failure to escape from the idea that only students resist, even if she recasts this as resistance to her own regime of truth. The notion of student resistance as the only resistance in classrooms is, in fact, an example of a resistant regime of truth within creative pedagogy theory.

Repetitive Tales of Performative Resistances

Written together, the following tales of seemingly 'isolated' incidents are exposed as pervasive repetitions of oppressive processes which constitute the context in which the work of creative pedagogy is *resisted*. These tales are 'plucked' from an array of repetitious acts which materialize sex, sexuality, class, and race.

Sexual Harrassment--The Unchanging Climate

The first tale of repetitious performativity and hence materializing of sex (gender) in an educational context is resistance of male professors in the Political Science Department at the University of Victoria to the "Chilly Climate Committee"--a group composed of one non-tenured female professor and undergraduate and graduate female students--struck by the department to explore issues of concern to female members of the department.

The original Committee has been eroded over the past two years by threats and denial of the concerns outlined in their report. Punitive actions against the group include threat of a lawsuit and written diatribes against the committee in general and the non-tenured professor in particular sent to socialist, left-leaning, 'progressive' male professors in Political Science, Sociology and other like departments across Canada.[2] Two formal commissions have been struck to investigate the happenings. One commission ruled in favour of the tenured male professors while the other commission came out in favour of the Chilly Climate Committee, offering suggestions to address concerns originating from the original report and strategies to address the current chilly climate. The report in favour of the Chilly Climate Committee has been ignored and one of the eight male professors has been appointed Chair. The non-tenured female Professor has been on stress leave most of the last two years.

The *resistance* to the Chilly Climate Report is a repetition of concerns outlined in the report. Resistance to the report has taken the form of active denial and charges that the eight tenured male professors are the ones harrassed, oppressed and denied 'academic freedom' especially by the non-tenured female professor, thus, as Chandra Mohanty describes, personalizing and managing 'difference' in higher education (Mohanty 1994).[3]

---

[2] For example, a paper by Professor Warren Magnusson dated May 13, 1992 and entitled "Feminism, McCarthyism and Sexist Fundamentalism" includes solicited attachments from female support staff as well as a letter from another tenured professor within the Department of Political Science at the University of Victoria. This paper, intended only for 'sympathetic' readers soas to resist open debate, was leaked to me.

Like David Mamet's play, *Oleanna*, the resistance to the Chilly Climate Report repeats the status quo notion that female students or professors exercise the same power within educational settings as male professors. Like the resistance to the Chilly Climate Report, the play invites sympathy for male professors who are seen as harassed by often pathetic, occasionally nasty female students.[4] Both the play and the resistance to the report repeat well-known tropes of the all-powerful and evil Female, while simultaneously downplaying the everyday reality of sexual harrassment for those materialized as women. When the play, *Oleanna*, was enacted recently within an educational context in the Faculty of Education, ostensibly to open dialogue, it became clear to many female graduate students that they are not in a position to expose the repetitious lie of the play--that female students exercise the same (or more) institutional power as male professors.

My second tale plucked from repetitons of the status quo is an experience within a graduate seminar setting in which the content of the course was to be devoted to the interrogation of methodologies, categories and the assumptions around them. One of the first articles for seminar discussion was replete with the term 'man' to refer to--I was not sure--either generic for humans or male for men. My observation spoken into the class was that to use 'man' in this way is obfuscatory. This was met with sighs or silence from most of the class participants, followed by a pontification by the instructor about 'political correctness'. I registered my astonishment by asking about the implications of taking up the category 'political correctness' as a response to my interrogation in a course intended to interrogate categories and assumptions underpinning them. At the break the instructor privately advised me that he was attempting to provoke me and push my thinking beyond the formalities of language. I saw his action as a repetition of a technique applied over and over--an action to marginalize, trivialize, and cast pejoratives against those who challenge received wisdom. Exercise of institutional power to wrest dialogue back from a 'pesky' feminist is a repetitive performativity of everyday materialization of 'masculinity' and 'femininty', of 'teachers' and 'students'. What I learned from this exchange is that instructors are also *resisting* when not wishing to confront ways in which their performativity materializes them as privileged. I exercised the only viable resistance available to me: I dropped the course.

---

[3] This resistance exposes the limitations, perhaps failure, of critical thinking among those who purport to 'teach' students. The requirement for students to be reflexive and critical in the face of a demonstrated inability to do the same exposes the false boundary erected between students and instructors as to who does critical and reflective work.

[4] Reviews report audiences cheering the male professor when he slaps the female student because she "deserved" it.

The Una(bash)ed Reality of Lesbian and Gay Lives--Invisibility and Intolerance

Tired public repetitions of resistance which cast lesbians as "immoral and unnatural and undermining and destroying our Canadian values and Christian morality"

(Geller 1994, 10), or claims that "if you're a woman, coloured, and a lesbian, you're laughing all the way to the bank"[5] (Gudgeon and Leiren-Young 1994) would be laughable if they were not so central to the context of the materialization of lesbians and gays as outsiders to educational concerns.

Resistance to a recent screening by CBC television station of *Out: Stories of Lesbian and Gay Youth*--a film of potential benefit to lesbian and gay youth attempting to cope with homophobia in and outside of schools, including "gay bashing", includes the interpretation of the film by Reform party members as "the promotion of gay and lesbian lifestyles". Likewise, in the United States, attempts to introduce programs to facilitate awareness of difficulties faced by lesbian and gay youth in a homophobic culture are resisted with the charge that a homosexual 'lifestyle' is being promoted (Harris, 1994, 103).[6]

I have my own tired war-worn out tales from academe, tangible exemplars of the daily, repetitive acts of heterosexism and homophobia. One of the more paradoxical repetitions was the way in which a student-colleague working on issues of religious intolerance exposed himself as intolerant. He cast his intolerance toward homosexuality as an expression of religious freedom, while criticizing public education as a site of intolerance towards him and his religious practice. It did not seem to occur to him that there might be lesbian and gay students in the classroom.[7] His promotion of homophobic intolerance while arguing for tolerance in education and my 'inability' to challenge his intolerance is a repetitious silencing with which lesbians and gay men are all too familiar. These repetitions are not only the purview of religious fundamentalists--in other contexts, progressive feminist student-colleagues have indicated their concern that their organizations were being seen as run by "nothing but a bunch of lesbians".[8]

---

[5] Which bank, the food bank?

[6] Reference to 'lifestyle' to designate sexuality 'identity' is as ridiculous as calling First Nations' cultures, or any other culture, a lifestyle.

As part of my litany of the performativity of homophobia and heterosexism, I offer, as an example of resistance to heterosexist expectations in academia and to the student/teacher binary as dividing erotic attention, the tale of a student who fell in love with his professor of gay literature . Both were male, one was married, the other in a partnership. The department was scandalised. Thinly-disguised gossip circulated, ostensibly regarding safety and concern for the student, the integrity of the department, the emotional tone of the classroom, and whether a course on gay literature could be offered ever again, given these circumstances! The student was outed, never consulted about his safety, needs and concerns. The professor was expected to defend and explain in an una(bash)edly homophobic setting to many una(bash)edly homophobic heterosexuals. The student did not lay complaints of harassment against the professor. Indeed, the professor was not the harasser. The harassment occurred in the repetitious acts of homophobia which erased any possibility of a forum for the student to disrupt this resistant performativity to homosexuality.

---

[7] That he was in the presence of at least three homosexual bodies reveals the ultimate irony of his ignorance and intolerance. That we three listened patiently to his testimony of intolerance is testimony to the tolerance of lesbians and gay men in the face of those who would oppress us, even on our own paid class time. This is testimony as well, to the dangers to homosexual bodies to speak 'out' against intolerance, an act that would indeed out them in unsafe places.

[8] Do lesbians always come in bunches like bananas? When in bunches, are lesbians really "nothing but"? Why is it so dreadful to have a feminist organization cast in this way?

In a paper presented at the Canadian Learneds Conference and intended as an addition to her academic file, Kathleen Martindale recounts her astonishment that a former department chair from another university had interceded in a hiring process because *resistant* to her lesbian identity. In an act of resistance, Martindale writes:

> [A]s a result of hearing about this letter...I decided to switch my primary involvement from feminist ethics to lesbian literary theory. As long as I've been punished for not being 'mainstream enough'...why not be fully guilty of doing it?....The letter and my theorizing about it will appear in print, and will be added to my file of publications when I come up for tenure. That is, I want to use my textual experience and my interpretation of its theoretical and political implications to further my academic career and possibly my notoriety, as well as to scare homophobes from thinking they can continue to get away with this behavior. (Martindale 1991, 2, 4)

Re-Colonialization of the Post-Colonial or New-Age Racism

Cultural work in education in Canada which attempts to 'race' processes of racialization in classrooms and educational institutions must be understood in the context of Canadian life. Non-natives in this country have yet to collectively face our complicity with delays in settling Native land claims, with the establishment of residential schools, and with Native alcohol and drug abuse, while we nevertheless appropriate and/or romanticize Native culture for purposes of tourism or to assuage guilt. My son's textbook for a grade six social studies class, for example, describes

Kwaitkutl potlatch without reference to the fact that potlatch, as with Native religions, was criminalized in Canadian law in the last century.[9] The history of eurowestern immigration to North America is euphemistically called "discovery and settlement", with the Confederation of Five Nations, the Iroquois nation described as "barbaric, savage and highly feared" by eurowesterns with no further context provided. The grade six students are left with ideas of barbaric Indians with quaint customs who were discovered and civilized by eurowestern 'culture'.[10] The reality of xenophobia, assimilation and oppression that is the history of First Nations peoples in Canada is erased. As well, cultural workers in education who hope to 'race' curriculum and pedagogy which racializes white bodies as those that matter are working in the context of a general sentiment in Canada, captured by the Reform Party, that immigration (significantly of visible immigrants) must be reduced. The Reform Party has recently generated a report that 'shows' immigrants to be more criminal than 'regular'

---

[9] The same textbook published in 1980 (Garrod, McFadden and Neering 1980) in use in 1994 in the Edmonton Public School System presents 'Man the Hunter' as the originator of tool use, thus erasing all women from involvement in the evolution of culture.

[10] Work which represents the *resistance* of Natives to decades of colonization is not represented. Chrystos writes:

"My knee is wounded so badly that I limp constantly
Anger is my crutch   I hold myself upright with it
                My knee is wounded
                    see
                        How I Am Still Walking" (Chrystos 1988, 7)

Work which problematizes classroom textbooks, for example the book edited by Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, entitled *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education* (1993) have had no impact on education-as-usual in Alberta schools.

Canadians.[11]

I continue this litany by addressing the content of some of my post-secondary education because the content of education reflects a 'white' perspective masquerading as either universal or worthwhile in a tired repetition of texts and canon. "The canon" I received during my undergraduate years included a course entitled World History: From the Fall of the Roman Empire to Just Before World War II. This "survey course of world history" was a specific segment of European history and selected areas of Europe at that. An introductory survey course on women consisted of philosophy, sociology, family structure, history, psychology, and issues about (some) women in a eurowestern tradition--specifically within an English speaking tradition of the British Isles, Canada, and the United States. In a survey of English literature, the same content appeared, even further limited by an almost complete lack of women's literature. My courses in psychology purported to include 'human' behaviors, statistics, developmental theories, personality and psychopathology but were all premised on information from eurowestern peoples, except 'deviance', a category which marks those different from normalised categories.

The content of mainstream' education either pathologizes those outside a eurowestern tradition or presents a liberal multiculturalist view, and as such is a *resistance* to any curriculum which might undermine repetitions of eurocentricism. Native Studies, Black Studies, Women's Studies and Gay Studies, when tolerated, are offered elsewhere and not, therefore, mainstreamed into curricula. Yet, even reflexive curriculum whether in "studies" programs or mainstream programs often fails to undermine dynamics which keep racism in place. A graduate course whose content and method were to involve participants in a reflexive questioning of their own racialization reconfigured racism--*resisting* students (teachers in other contexts) played out the dynamics of white racism in relation to the nonwhite instructor. The course was challenged as anti-intellectual, bringing down the intellectual rigour of the department, not scholarly enough, and discriminatory. Those who did not have this experience of the course were 'unable' to say so; only some--those already privileged as white and male--were able to exercise *resistance* in the classroom; only they felt safe to discuss their discomfort within seminar time. But what was being *resisted*; who was being *resisted*; and by whom? Those who felt discriminated against failed to see the irony of charging a nonwhite person with discrimination in a course designed to interrogate ways in which systemic discrimination impacts on education. Like the response to the Chilly Climate Report at the University of Victoria, those most privileged were in a position to publicly vocalize their feelings thus exposing (except perhaps to themselves) the systemic way in which some come to matter through processes of racialization, genderization, and sexualization. From this course, I learned just how difficult is the project of education for social change even among those who consciously take the course with social change in mind. Even among 'progressive' people, *resistance* to self-reflection and critical awareness is immediate and strong.

---

[11] What would be the starting point for turning back 'bad' immigrants? An examination of the crimes of early immigrants against Natives reveals a history of eurowestern criminality. Perhaps relatives of these "immigrants should go home".

New Age Clas(sic)Education--Class-ification According to Who Can Afford It

One of the most sobering challenges to education in Canada today comes in the form of regressive government economic measures which resist possibilities of education for those with few resources. I refer here to both provincial and federal government policy that will effectively limit post-secondary education in particular, but have an impact on education at all levels. Implications of the federal government *Green Paper*, released September 1994, are a doubling of university tuition fees as soon as 1996. The province of Alberta *White Paper*, released October 20, 1994, will increase tuition by 50% over the next five years and retain the 100% differential fee for international students. Both have implications for student loans as well. The provincial document in particular has negative implications while the federal document speaks of easing student repayment of loans in a variety of ways without acknowledging that overall debt-load will substantially increase over the course of long-term educational choices.

Current government policy further erodes many of the openings offered for those students without personal resources to attain post-secondary education by restricting and tightening student loan resources as well as increasing tuition fees. The doubling of international fees ensures that particular kinds of students from countries other than Canada will be able to afford to come to Canada for their post-secondary education. The net effect is a further class-ification of higher education into a place reserved for those with access to financial resources, thus intensifying the repetition that education is for those who merit it, where merit is understood almost solely in financial terms.

Even when those with fewer financial resources manage to attend post-secondary institutions, the education they can expect to find there is one which often replicates middle-class values, thus materializing only some embodied experiences as important. Classrooms, including creative pedagogical classrooms, often promote non-conflictual, nurturing interactions, values of the middle-class (Martindale 1992) and, as Walkerdine and Lucey (1989) indicate, discourses of pedagogy assume that middle-class values are 'natural', while promoting the notion that everyone could "potentially be middle class with the right brains and the right mothers" (Walkerdine and Lucey 1989, 178).

Contextualizing Resistance: Resistance as Status Quo, Vive la Resistance

I have repeated this abbreviated litany in order to note the context within which creative pedagogies are taken up, as well as to highlight that there are myriad ways in which the performativity of oppressive processes of differentiation materialize bodies. I also want to emphasize that, even as "regimes of truth" which materialize race, gender, class, and sexuality operate to resist alternate discourses, each is productive of strategies and actions of resistance. My point, following Foucault, is that where there is an exercise of power, there is resistance.

> [T]here are no relations of power without resistances; the latter are all the more real and effective because they are formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised; resistance to power does not

> have to come from elsewhere to be real, nor is it inexorably frustrated through being the compatriot of power. It exists all the more by being in the same place as power; hence like power, resistance is multiple... (Foucault 1980b, 142)

Just as power is not owned and exerted by those 'in charge', resistance is not owned by those who are 'oppressed'. Both power and resistance are exercised in relation to actions of others. For example, not only do non-white people resist exercise of white power, white people often resist this resistance by non-whites. Since everyone can exercise or perform acts of resistance, it is necessary, then, to distinguish between those performances that reproduce the status quo and those that do not.

Performativity of Resistance: Status Quo as Repetitious Viciousness

In the example of the Chilly Climate Committee at the University of Victoria, eight tenured male professors are resisting the Chilly Climate Report. The Chilly Climate Committee in turn is resisting the hegemonic male perspective within the Political Science Department and the eight tenured male professors. In the seminar to interrogate categories and assumptions, I resisted a discursive language that I found confusing and misleading. The male professor resisted my feminist claims about dislocating other assumptions. In the seminar on education for societal change, certain colleagues resisted the content and process of the course as well as the instructor's efforts to lead such a seminar. The instructor resisted these charges, as did many others in the class. The course was itself a resistance to standard canon and method.

What must be explored is *what* and *who* is resisted in each of these situations. It is my contention that bodies that are materialized as mattering in a culture often resist or perform in ways that reproduce the status quo--through a performativity of repetitious acts that produce sexist, racist, class-ist, heterosexist processes of differentiation. Thus, a white male student is able to exercise resistance towards an Other-than white male professor reconfiguring a tired performativity of racialization, and tenured male professors are able to exercise resistance towards a non-tenured female professor, reconfiguring performativities of genderization.

Since female professors and students are materialized differently than male professors and students, lesbian or gay professors and students are materialized differently than heterosexual professors and students, and since professors and students racialized Other-than white are materialized differently than students and professors racialized white, resistance can operate to preserve or weaken existing structures. Each of these categories may be further confounded by overlap from other categories as well: some embodiments are female, lesbian and black for example and materialized embodiment must be understood as inclusive of all the processes invoked by these. How each person participating in a seminar or classroom is materialized affects how each is able to exercise resistance in the service of the status quo or resistance that disrupts expected repetitions of normalized performativity.

Border Crossings--Conscious and Unconscious

Henry Giroux calls for transformative intellectuals to become border crossers

(1992) or take up the spaces between borders (1994) in acts to disrupt safety of fixed categories. While I think this is a worthwhile project, my concern is with lack of attention to who is border crossing and in what contexts.

In her ground-breaking work *Borderlands: La Frontera* (1987), Gloria Anzaldua writes about the hybrid spaces, the intersections inhabited by those who cross borders. For Anzaldua, this intersection is the space-bridge between anglo and latina cultures, between heterosexual and lesbian cultures, between male and female cultures, and between resourced and poor, working class cultures. Anzaldua herself moves uneasily within interstitial spaces that bridge all these. Given the privileged hierarchy inherent within the categories, Anzaldua's location is different from that of Giroux in complicated and important ways. It is not that border crossing per se is problematic, it is that for those marginalized in borderlands, border crossing has been a matter of immediate and personal survival. Border crossings have always occurred at the margins by both those who are marked in dominating and dominated ways. Thus many heterosexuals were delighted with the antics of Liberace without spelling out exactly what they found so profoundly delightful, and many marginalized peoples border cross without the intention of challenging and changing the status quo.

Conscious border crossing, that is crossing that is done to deliberately disrupt or perform against hierarchy, has always occurred as well. Anzaldua and others like her have consciously resisted or performed in this way against the status quo. My concern is one of caution to those from dominant groups who would wish to perform border crossings as resistance. Border crossers from dominant groups need to spell out if their acts are resistance or further acts of violence against marginalized groups: voyeurism, cultural tourism, or cultural appropriation.

Performance of Resistance: Vive La Resistance

> **"RESISTANCE IS THE SECRET OF JOY!"** (Walker 1992, 279, emphasis in original)

I would like to add parenthetically to this statement by Alice Walker the following : **"resistance (to the status quo) is the secret of joy"**.

Resistance to the status quo may be manifested in a number of different ways. Often resistance to the status quo is reflected in the embodiment of those in classrooms not meant for them. Those whose bodies are materialized as either not mattering or mattering less nevertheless challenge the status quo either consciously or unconsciously just by being where they have hitherto not been welcome. Women in engineering departments, Natives in Law classrooms, people of colour in women's studies classrooms, queers in education seminars, poor and working class people in literature courses; all resist the lie of the 'normal' homogenous student or teacher.

There are important differences between the resistance possible through the materialization of 'other' bodies in education, however, and a self-conscious, disruptive performance of the repetitious performativity of education-as-usual. Maria Lugones writes about the double image of self that those who are "outsider to the mainstream" have (Lugones 1987, 13) . Taking up the caricature that materialization of Latino is taken to mean within mainstream United States culture, Lugones theorizes the disruptive aspects of a double image:

> [W]hen in one "world" I animate, for example, that "world's" caricature of the person I am in the other "world." I can have both images of myself and to the extent that I can materialize or animate both images at the same time I become an ambiguous being....One then sees any particular "world" with these double edges and sees absurdity in them and so inhabits oneself differently. Given that latins are constructed in Anglo "worlds" as sterotypically intense--intensity being a central characteristic of at least one of the anglo stereotypes of latins--and given that many latins, myself included, are genuinely intense, I can say to myself "I am intense" and take a hold of the double meaning. And furthermore, I can be stereotypically intense or be the real thing and, if you are Anglo, you do not know when I am which because I am Latin -American. As Latin-American I am an ambiguous being, a two-imaged self: I can see that gringos see me as sterotypically intense because I am, as a Latin-American, constructed that way but I may or may not *intentionally* animate the stereotype or the real thing knowing that you may not see it in anything other than in the stereotypical construction This ambiguity is funny and not just funny, it is survival-rich. (Lugones 1987, 13, 14, emphasis in original)

This playfulness is similar to Judith Butler's notion that agency is to be found in the parody of performativity--in which in the "giddiness of the performance is the recognition of a radical contingency...of cultural configurations of causal unities that are regularly assumed to be natural and necessary" (Butler 1990, 137-138). Parody as a disruption of expected repetitions of gender, race, class, and sexuality performativity can be used to undermine the presumed 'naturalness' of these categories. For example, Butler describes how parodic performance can resist dominant discourses about AIDS through the "theatricalization of political rage in response to the killing inattention of public policy-makers" (Bulter 1993, 223).

> [H]yperbolic "performance" of death in the practice of "die-ins" and the theatrical "outness" by which queer activism has disrupted the closeting distinction between public and private space have proliferated sites of

> politicization and AIDS awareness throughout the public realm... [T]heatrical rage reiterates those injuries precisely through an "acting out," one that does not merely repeat or recite those injuries, but that also deploys a hyperbolic display of death and injury to overwhelm the epistemic resistance to AIDS and to the graphics of suffering, or a hyperbolic display of kissing to shatter the epistemic blindness to an increasingly graphic and public homosexuality. (Butler 1993, 232, 233)

Like Lugones' play with ethnicity, playing with gender ambiguity exposes the limits and exclusions of heteronormativity. Drag queens and butch dykes are the queer cultural equivalents to native tricksters and fools.

Processes of racialization, genderization, and sexualization can be disrupted by resistant performances and playfulness. Like genealogy and deconstruction, performance of parody permits an interrogation of identity production. And, almost certainly, even more than genealogy and deconstruction, parody requires an informed reader. Both Maria Lugones and Judith Butler understand that playfulness with stereotypical notions can as easily consolidate a category as disrupt it. As Butler indicates, "practices of parody can serve to reengage and reconsolidate the very distinction between privileged and naturalized gender [race, sexuality, ability, class] configuration and one that appears as derived, phantasmatic, and mimetic--a failed copy, as it were" (Bulter 1990, 146).

Would it be possible to adopt parody as a resistant strategy in classrooms? What would a classroom be like in which those materialized as not mattering were to play with or parody stereotypical repetitions of themselves or perform stereotypical notions of dominant cultures consisting of 'drag' performances of gender, race, and/or class in which the artifice of these categories is exposed? With gender 'impersonation' as the model, race and class 'impersonation' could also be encouraged such that the notion of 'impersonation' of "the very notion of an original" (Bulter 1990, 138) is also exposed. As Butler indicates, "there must be a way to understand what makes certain kinds of parodic repetitions effectively disruptive, *truly troubling*, and which repetitions become domesticated and recirculated as instruments of cultural hegemony" (Butler 1990, 139, emphasis added).

Playfulness and parody are not the only kind of disruption. Reflexive confessional telling (Bernstein 1992), as I have used it earlier in this chapter as counter discursive practice, is another example of a disruptive, resistant strategy which serves as a kind of witnessing.[12] Various methods and contents of creative pedagogy, including popular culture, operate as counter discourse and therefore as a resistance to the status quo of education-as-usual even when, in Elizabeth Ellsworths' words, it often does not feel empowering (Ellsworth 1989).

Notwithstanding the criticisms I have directed at creative pedagogy in this work, creative pedagogy does trouble the waters of educational practice by resisting education as maintenance of the status quo. Like Judith Butler, I believe that "*trouble* need not carry...a negative valence" (Butler 1990, ix, emphasis added). The trouble created in classrooms by resisting bodies is worth fostering. Creative pedagogies, already troublesome to mainstream education, would do well *to look for trouble* in classrooms, seminars, hallways, meetings, committees and every site of education, because to do otherwise is to repeat performativities that preserve the status quo.

---

[12] Dori Laub writes, "Testimonies are not monologues; they cannot take place in solitude. The witnesses are talking to somebody; to somebody they have been waiting for for a long time" (Felmon and Laub 1992, 71-72).

Summary

In part, the presentation of this chapter has been intended as a performance of repetitive performativities of the materialization of sex, race, sexuality, and class in order to expose the status quo as repetitious artifice. I have intended these repetitions to show that both those disrupting and repeating the status quo *resist*. In doing so, I have resisted the notion that *resistance* is possible only by students to teachers in classrooms and unproblematized by race, gender, class, or sexuality politics. Resistance understood in this way makes it possible to deconstruct, from yet another angle, the teacher-student binary.

AFTERWORD

> What is a last chapter for? Re-evaluation? Summation? The opportunity to wrap everything up neatly? Ah, closure. It is so reassuring. Like checking items off a list of projects to be completed. And when the last item is crossed off, doesn't it feel good to sit back and see what you've done? (Marshall 1992, 179)

Within social science research-as-usual, this space is reserved for a summary of findings and concluding remarks with indications for future research. In exceptionally 'solid' work, statistics would have been produced to support hypotheses, correlations would have been made, and scientific method would have been satisfied by the rigour and fortitude of the researcher and the research.

> They shuffle uncomfortably in a shared space, rub shoulders angrily, eye each other suspiciously, laugh, and look for the door. There is none. They are neither outside nor inside. Sometimes they clasp hands in recognition, and then begin to dispute. Each has a definition, each resists definition, each defines the other. Each is a node within a multi-dimensional network, one of the uncountable nodes. From each node project threads which tangle with the threads of other nodes. Together they do not make a tapestry. No coherent picture emerges because there is no one who is not part of the network, there is no position from which to step back and take a look, no one sitting on the other end of Archimedes' lever. This is not chaos, this not anarchy, this is not entropy, although it may be chaotic, anarchic, entropic. There is sense here, but not safe sense. Sense made here is limited, local, provisional, and always critical. Self-critical. That is sense within the postmodern moment. That is the postmodern. (Marshall 1991, 2)

As a post-positivist researcher, what can I safely conclude in this my afterword; this open-ended afterward? Words fixed on paper are like moths and butterflies pinned onto corkboard: frozen into a lifelessness. Each is fragile in that if bumped, an edge, a wing, a body may be lost or disintegrate entirely into something else: powder. Words imprisoned on paper can capture neither a fluidity of living nor those exclusions and absences which exceed categorization, one of the cornerstones of social science research-as-usual.

All I can safely say at this juncture is that there are no certain answers to be found in an interrogation of creative pedagogy. Like Foucault, I believe that, especially in these troubled times, everything is dangerous. I take up the interrogation of creative pedagogy in a troubling and troubled way.

> The word has been spoken. Books close, eyes close. Oh dear, that again. (Marshall 1992, 2)

References

Abwunza, Judith. Conversation between cultures: Outrageous Voices? Presentation to the Critical Difference Conference, University of Alberta, Sept. 22-24, 1993.

Anzaldua, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands La Frontera: The new Mestiza.* San Fransisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Aronowitz, Stanley and Henry A. Giroux. 1993. *Education still under seige.* Second Edition. Westport, Connecticut and London: Bergin & Garvey.

Bannerji, Himani, ed. 1993. *Returning the gaze: Essays on racism, feminism and politics.* Toronto: Sister Vision Press.

Barrett Browning, Elizabeth. 1979. *Aurora Leigh: A poem.* New York: Cassandra Editions.

Bernstein, S. D. 1992. Confessing feminist theory: What's "I" got to do with it? *Hypatia* 7(2): 120-147.

Boyarin, Jonathan. 1992. *Storm in paradise: The politics of Jewish memory.* New York and London: Routledge.

Brandt, Willie. 1980. *North-South: A program for survival.* Sydney: Pan Books.

Briskin, Linda and Rebecca Priegert Coulter. 1992. Feminist pedagogy: Challenging the normative. *Canadian Journal of Education* 17(3): 247-263.

Britzman, Deborah. 1991. *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Britzman, Deborah. 1993. Is there a queer pedagogy?: Or, stop being [acting?] straight! Paper presented at Bergamo Conference on Curriculum Theorizing, Dayton, Ohio: October.

Brodribb, Somer. 1992. *Nothing mat(t)ers: A feminist critique of postmodernism.* Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.

Brookes, Anne-Louise. 1992. *Feminist pedagogy: An autobiographical approach.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Butler, Judith. 1986. Sex and gender in Simone de Beauvoir's *Second Sex*. *Yale French Studies* 72. *Simone de Beauvoir: Witness to a century*. Helene Vivienne Wenzel, ed., 35-49.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York and London: Routledge.

Butler, Judith. 1991. Imitation and gender subordination: In *inside/out: Lesbian theories, gay theories*, Diana Fuss, ed. New York and London: Routledge, 13-31.

Butler, Judith. 1992. Contingent foundations: Feminism and the question of "postmodernism". In *Feminists theorize the political*. Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 3-21.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York and London: Routledge.

Butler, Judith and Joan Scott, eds. 1992. *Feminists theorize the political*. New York and London: Routledge.

Campioni, Mia and Elizabeth Grosz. 1991. Love's labours lost: Marxism and feminism. In *A reader in feminist knowledge*. Sneja Gunew, ed. London and New York: Routledge, 366-397.

Chow, Rey. 1993. *Writing diaspora: Tactics of intervention in contemporary cultural studies*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana Univerity Press.

Chrystos. 1988. *Not Vanishing*. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers.

Cornell, Drucilla. 1992. *The philosophy of the limit*. New York and London: Routledge.

Crosby, Christina. 1992. Dealing with differences. In *Feminists theorize the political*. Judith Butler and Joan Scott, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 130-143.

Culler, Jonathan. 1982. *On deconstruction: Theory and criticism after structuralism*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Davidson, Cathy. 1991. "PH" stands for political hypocrisy. *Academe* Sept./Oct: 1-7.

de Beauvoir. 1952. *The second sex.* H. M. Parshley, trans. Toronto, London, New York: Bantam Books.

de Lauretis, Teresa. 1984. *Alice doesn't: Feminism, semiotics, cinema.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press

de Lauretis, Teresa. 1991. Queer theory: Lesbian and gay sexualities An Introduction. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 3(2): iii-xviii.

Derrida, Jacques. 1981. *Positions.* A. Bass, trans. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

du Cille, Ann. The occult of black womanhood: Critical demeanor and black feminist studies. *Signs*19(3): 591-629.

Ellsworth, Elizabeth. 1992. Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. In *Feminisms and critical pedagogy.* Carmen Luke and Jennifer Gore, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 90-119..

Eyre, Linda. 1993. Compulsory heterosexuality in a university classroom. *Canadian Journal of Education* 18(3): 273-284.

Fanon, Frantz. 1990. The fact of blackness. In *The anatomy of racism.* David Theo Goldberg. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Felmon, Shoshana and Dori Laub. 1992. *Testimony: Crises in witnessing in literature, psychoanalysis, and history.* New York: Routledge.

Fine, Michelle. 1987. Silencing in public schools. *Language Arts* Feb.: 157-174.

Flax, Jane. 1990. *Thinking fragments: Psychoanalysis, feminism, and postmodernism in the contemporary west.* Berkeley and Los Angeles and Oxford: University of California Press.

Flax, Jane. 1992. The end of innocence. In *Feminists theorize the political.* Judith Butler and Joan Scott, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 445-463.

Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and punish.* Alan Sheridan, trans. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1980a. *The History of sexuality Vol I: An introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1980b. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977.* Colin Gordon, ed. New York: Pantheon.

Fraser, Nancy and Linda Nicholson. 1990. Social criticism without philosophy: An encounter between feminism and postmodernism. In *Feminism/postmodernism*. Linda Nicholson, ed. New York and London: Routledge, 19-38.

Freire, Paulo. 1974. *Education for critical consciousness.* London: Sheed and Ward.

Freire, Paulo. 1978. *Pedagogy in process: Letters to Guinea-Bissau*. London: Writers and Readers Cooperative.

Freire, Paulo. 1989. *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum. (from the 1972 edition).

Freire, Paulo. 1993. *Pedagogy of the city.* New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo and Donaldo Macedo. 1987. *Literacy: Reading the word and the world.* South Hadley, Massachusett: Bergin & Garvey.

Freire, Paulo and Antonio Faundez. 1989. *Learning to question: A pedagogy of liberation.* New York: Continuum.

Fulton, Keith Louise. 1991. Journalling women: The authentic voice and intellectual cross-dressing. In *Women Changing Academe*. S. Kirby, D. Daniels, K. McKenna, M. Pujol and M. Valiquette, eds. Winnipeg: Sororal Publishing, 157-166.

Fuss, Diana. 1991. Inside/out. In *Inside/out: Lesbian theories, gay theories.* D. Fuss, ed. New York and London: Routledge, 1-12.

Garber, Linda. 1994. *Tilting the tower.* New York and London: Routledge.

Garrod, Stan, Fred McFadden and Rosemary Neering. 1980. *Canada: Growth of a nation.* Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside.

Geller, Lissa. 1994. Lesbian bashing in parliament. *Kinesis*, November.

George, Susan. 1987. *A fate worse than debt.* Ringwood: Penguin.

Giroux, Henry. 1988. Border pedagogy in the age of postmodernism. *Journal of Education* 170(3): 162-181.

Giroux, Henry. 1990. *Postmodernism, feminism, and cultural politics.* New York and London: Routledge.

Giroux, Henry. 1992a. *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education.* New York and London: Routledge.

Giroux, Henry. 1992b. Resisting difference: Cultural studies and the discourse of critical pedagogy. In *Cultural studies.* Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 199-212.

Giroux, Henry. 1994a. Living dangerously: Identity politics and the new cultural racism. In *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies.* Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 29-55.

Giroux, Henry. 1994b. *Disturbing pleasures: Learning popular culture.* New York and London: Routledge.

Giroux, Henry and Peter McLaren, eds. 1994. *Between borders: Pedagogy and politics of cultural studies.* New York and London: Routledge.

Gore, Jennifer M. 1993. *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth.* New York and London: Routledge.

Gudgeon, Christopher and Mark Leiren-Young. 1994. *The little book of Reform.* Arsenel Pulp Press.

Harris, Elise. 1994. Seizing the initiative. *Out*, November: 102-106; 146-152.

Hatcher, Richard and Barry Troyna. 1993. Racialization and children. In *Race, identity and representation in education.* Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 109-125.

Hayter, J. and C. Watson. 1984. *Aids: Rhetoric and reality.* London: Pluto.

Hebdige, Dick. 1989. *Hiding the light.* New York and London: Routledge.

Hekman, Susan. 1991. Reconstituting the subject: Feminism, modernism, and postmodernism. *Hypatia* 6(2): 44-63.

Hicks, David, ed. 1988. *Education for peace: Issues, principles and practices in the classroom*. London and New York: Routledge.

hooks, bell. 1991. Black women intellectuals. In *Breaking bread: Insurgent Black Intellectuals*. By bell hooks and Cornell West. Boston: South End Press, 147-166.

hooks, bell. 1992. Representing whiteness in the black imagination. In *Cultural studies*. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 338-346.

hooks, bell. 1994. Eros, eroticism, and the pedagogical process. In *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 113-118.

Hutcheon, Linda. 1989. *The politics of postmodernism*. New York and London: Routledge.

Jaggar, Alison M. 1989. Love and knowledge: Emotion in feminist epistemology. In *Gender/body/knowledge: Feminist reconstructions of being and knowing*. Alison M. Jaggar and Susan R. Bordo, eds. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers Univerity Press, 145-171.

Kerby, Anthony. 1991. *Narrative and the self*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Kramarae, Cheris and Paula Treichler. 1985. *A feminist dictionary*. London: Pandora.

Lather, Patti. 1991. *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*. New York and London: Routledge.

Lessing, Doris. 1994. *Under my skin: Volume one of my autobiography, to 1949*. New York: Harper Collins. Reported in *Ms.* 5(2).

Lewis, Magda. 1993. *Without a word: Teaching beyond women's silences*. New York and London: Routledge.

Lorde, Audrey. 1984. *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Trumansburg, New York: Crossing Press.

Lugones, Maria. 1987. Playfulness, "world-travelling", and loving perception. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* 2(2): 3-20.

Lugones, Maria and Elizabeth Spelman. 1986. Have we got a theory for you! Feminist theory, cultural imperialism, and the demand for "the women's voice". In *Women and values: Readings in recent feminist philosophy*, Marilyn Pearsall, ed. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 19-31.

Luke, Carmen and Jennifer Gore, eds. 1992. *Feminisms and critical pedagogy*. New York and London: Routledge.

Mackinnon, Catharine. 1982. Feminism, marxism, method and the state: An agenda for theory. *Signs: Journal of Women, Culture and Society* 7(3): 515-544.

Marshall, Brenda. 1992. *Teaching the postmodern: Fiction and theory*. New York and London: Routledge.

Marshall, James. 1989. Foucault and education. *Australian Journal of Education* 33(3): 99-113.

Martindale, Kathleen. 1991. Provocations to resistance, provocations to theorize. Presented to ACUTE Learned Society, Prince Edward Island, June.

Martindale, Kathleen. 1992. Theorizing autobiography and materialist feminist pedagogy. *Canadian Journal of Education* 17(3): 321-334.

McCarthy, Cameron and Warren Crichlow. 1993. *Race, identity, and representation in education*. New York and London: Routledge.

McLaren, Peter and Peter Leonard, eds. 1993. *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter*. New York and London: Routledge.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1994. On race and voice: Challenges for liberal education in the 1990s. In *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 45-166.

Morrison, Toni, ed. 1992. *Race-ing justice, en-gendering power: Essays on Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas, and the Construction of Social Reality*. New York: Pantheon.

Murphy, Kelly. 1993. Pedagogy for postmodernity: Travels in poststructuralism, feminism, and education. M. Ed. thesis, University of Alberta.

Orner, Mimi. 1992. Interrupting the calls for student voice in "liberatory" education: A feminist poststructuralist perspective. In *Feminisms and critical pedagogy*. Carmen Luke and Jennifer Gore, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 74-89.

Penley, Constance. 1989. Teaching in your sleep: Feminism and psychoanalysis. In *The future of an illusion: Film, feminism and psychoanalysis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 165-181.

Razack, Sherene. 1993. Storytelling for social change. In *Returning the gaze: Essays on racism, feminism and politics*. Himani Bannerji, ed. Toronto: Sister Vision Press, 83-100.

Rich, Adrienne. 1979. *On lies, secrets, and silence: Selected prose 1966-1978*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Riley, Denise. 1988. *"Am I That Name?": Feminism and the category of 'women' in history*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rockhill, Kathleen. 1987. Gender, language and the politics of literacy. *British Journal of Education* 8: 153-67.

Roman, Leslie G. 1993. White is a Color! White defensiveness, postmodernism, and anti-racist pedagogy. In *Race, identity, and representation in education*. Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 71-88.

Rooney, Ellen. 1989. *Seductive reasoning: Pluralism as the problematic of contemporary literary theory*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Rorty, Richard. 1986. Freud and moral reflection. In *Pragmatism's Freud: The moral disposition of psychoanalysis*. J. H. Smith and W. Kerrigan, eds. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Sarup, Madan. 1989. *An introductory guide to Post-structuralism and postmodernism*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press.

Scribner, S. 1984. Literacy in three metaphors. *American Journal of Education* 93(1): 6-21.

Scott, Joan. 1988. Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: Or, the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism. *Feminist Studies* 14(1): 33-50.

Scott, Joan. 1992. Experience. In *Feminists theorize the political.* Judith Butler and Joan Scott, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 22-40.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 1990. *Epistemology of the closet.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Sheth, Anita and Amita Handa. 1993. A jewel in the frown: Striking accord between India/n feminists. In *Returning the gaze: Essays on racism, feminism and politics.* Himani Bannerji, ed. Toronto: Sister Vision Press, 38-82.

Shogan, Debra. 1994. Genealogy, the law, and silence in classrooms: Interrogating lesbian and gay experiences? Presented to the Journal of Curriculum Theory Conference, Banff, Alta., Oct. 6.

Smith, Malinda. 1994. From Managua to Bitburg: A discourse on the anti-semite and Jew in modernity. Unpublished paper.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics.* New York and London: Routledge.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. Can the subaltern speak? In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture.* C. Nelson and L. Grossberg, eds. Urbana: University of Ilinois Press, 271-313.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1990. *The postcolonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues.* New York and London: Routledge.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1991. Acting Bits/Identity Talk. *Critical Inquiry* 18(4): 770-803.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1993. *Outside in the teaching machine.* New York and London: Routledge.

Taylor, Paul V. 1993. *The texts of Paulo Freire.* Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Toh, Swee-Hin. 1992. Response to Class Project.

Walker, Alice. 1992. *Possessing the secret of joy: A novel.* New York, San Diego, London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Walkerdine, Valerie and H. Lucey. 1989. *Democracy in the kitchen? The regulation of mothers and the socialization of daughters*. London: Virago.

Watney, Simon. 1994. School's out. In *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies.* Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren, eds. New York and London: Routledge, 167-179.

Weedon, Chris. 1987. *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory.* Oxford: Blackwell.

West, Cornell. 1991. The dilemma of the black intellectual. In *Breaking bread: Insurgent black intellectual life.* By bell hooks and Cornell West. Boston: South End Press, 131-146.

West, Cornell, 1993. Preface. In *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter.* Peter McLaren and Peter Leonard, eds. New York and London: Routledge.

Williams, Patricia. 1991. *The alchemy of race and rights.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Young, Iris M. 1989. Polity and group difference: A critique of the ideal of a universal citizenship. *Ethics* 99(2): 25-274.

Young, Iris M. 1990. The ideal of community and the politics of difference. In *Feminism/postmodernism*. Linda Nicholson, ed. New York and London: Routledge, 300-323.

Yee, May. 1993. Finding the way home through the issues of gender, race and class. In *Returning the gaze: Essays in racism, feminism and politics*. Himani Bannerji, ed. Toronto: Sister Vision Press, 3-37.